THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NARRATIVE STRATEGIES AND MEANING IN WILLIAM GOLDING'S *THE INHERITORS, PINCHER MARTIN* AND *FREE FALL*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MUSTAFA ZEKİ ÇIRAKLI

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

MARCH 2010

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata

Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

_____

Prof. Dr. Wolf König

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz (METU, FLE) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez (METU, FLE) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ünal Norman (METU, FLE) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Aytül Özüm (HACETTEPE U. ELIT) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut (BAŞKENT Ü., AMER) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Mustafa Zeki ÇIRAKLI

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NARRATIVE STRATEGIES AND MEANING IN WILLIAM GOLDING'S *THE INHERITORS, PINCHER MARTIN* AND *FREE FALL*

ÇIRAKLI, Mustafa Zeki

Ph.D., English Literature

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez

March 2010, 203 Pages

This dissertation attempts to investigate the relationship between certain narrative strategies and meaning(s), and presents a narratological analysis of Golding's three novels. It primarily refers to the terminology offered by Genette and Rimmon-Kenan and, considering the mode of narration (voice) and the mode of focalization (mood), it tries to unearth narrative elements in narrative fiction. This dissertation argues that the implied author employs narrative agents and strategies of perspectivisation in order to affect, manipulate, determine or change the meaning(s), and that storytelling authority can be violated or balanced by monitority of perceiving. In *The Inheritors*, the implied author plays with shifting perspective to portray the other from within; in *Pincher Martin*, s/he explores temporality and timelessness to reveal post-mortem individual consciousness / unconsciousness, and in *Free Fall*, s/he produces a first-person retrospective narration where the protagonist deals with the act of story-telling and attempts to reconstruct his identity through manipulating subnarratives and perspectives.

Keywords: narrator (voice), focalizer (mood), narrative levels, perspective, authority/monitor-ity

ÖZ

WILLIAM GOLDING'İN *THE INHERITORS, PINCHER MARTIN* VE *FREE FALL* ADLI ROMANLARINDA ANLATI STRATEJİLERİ VE ANLAM ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ

ÇIRAKLI, Mustafa Zeki

Doktora, İngiliz Edebiyatı

Tez Yöneticisi: Yard. Doç. Dr. Margaret Sönmez

Mart 2010, 203 Sayfa

Bu tez anlatım teknikleri ile anlam arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemekte ve Golding'in üç romanının anlatıbilimsel bir analizini yapmaktadır. Bu çalışmada Genette ve Rimmon-Kenan'ın geliştirdikleri terminoloji kullanılmaktadır. Tez, anlatıcıyla doğrudan ilişkili "anlatıcı ses" ve odaklayıcı algıyla doğrudan ilişkili "anlatı modu"nu inceleyerek, anlatısal kurgu içindeki anlatı öğelerini açığa çıkarmaya çalışmaktadır. Buna göre, "varsayılan yazar" belli bir mesajı iletmek, anlamı etkilemek, değiştirmek ya da belirlemek için belli anlatı unsurları ve görünge stratejileri kullanmaktadır. Ayrıca, öykü-anlatmada mevcut olan otorite, odaklama tekniği sayesinde, görme ve algılama monitorite'si ile dengelenmektedir. Bu tez, varsayılan yazarın, *Mirrasçılar*'da "öteki"ni içerden bir gözle yansıtmak amacıyla değişken görüngelerle nasıl oynadığını, *Pincher Martin*'de ölüm sonrası bilinç/bilinçdışını yansıtmak için anlatı düzeyleri ve odaklama yöntemi aracılığıyla zaman kavramını nasıl manipüle ettiğini, ve *Serbest Düşme*'de birinci şahıs anlatım, alt anlatılar ve değişken görüngeler yardımıyla, geçmişi araştırırken, aynı zamanda öykü anlatmayı kimliğin yeniden inşası için nasıl kullandığını göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: anlatıcı (ses), odaklayıcı (mod), anlatı düzeyleri, görünge, otorite/monitorite.

To Cemile,
my devoted and beloved wife

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Chief among those who have been indispensible to my efforts throughout this study are my supervisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez, who has provided me with illuminating guidance, critical feedback and motivational support, and Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz and Asst. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut, who have also encouraged me with invaluable insights and erudite comments. I extend my sincere thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ünal Norman, whose wisdom has always guided me, and Assist. Prof. Dr. Aytül Özüm, whose reassuring comments are of note here.

I am also indebted to Dr. Deniz Arslan, Dr. Rüçhan Kayalar and Dr. Berkem Gürenci, who have supported me throughout the process and whose comments have played a significant role in this dissertation. I also would like to thank Prof. Dr. Jochen Rehbein, Dr. Jutta Fienemann, Dr. Silke Lahn and Stephanie Neu (IC Narratology Group) for supporting me in Hamburg University days, and Banu Özkan Akçeşme, İbrahim Tanrıkulu and Ferit Kılıçkaya for helping me in revising the last version of this dissertation.

The last but not least, I am appreciated to Bengisu, my four-year-old daughter, who has backed me up with innocent prayer, which I feel has been among the most memorable ones.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The pill has to be sugared.
William Golding, *The Hot Gates*

Narrative always says less than it knows
but often makes known more than it says.
Gerard Genette, *Narrative Discourse*

This dissertation will investigate the relationship between narrative strategies and meaning in Golding's fiction and it has three aims. First, it will attempt to reread and analyse William Golding's *The Inheritors (IN), Pincher Martin (PM)* and *Free Fall (FF)* by using Genettean terminology. Second, it will try to analyse what narrative strategies these technical elements indicate. Third, it will show how these strategies can be linked to the meanings and already established interpretations of the novels. The thesis argues that in *IN*, the implied author employs shifting perspectives to explore the issue of otherness; in *PM*, s/he plays with temporality to reflect post-mortem individual un(consciousness); and in *FF*, he deals with reconstruction of self and identity through retrospection.

Friedman notes, William Golding deals with the conflict between good and evil in the human self. He always draws attention to "the limits of human knowledge and power" and emphasizes "the darkness within" the human soul (11). Therefore, his characters are usually seen in the process of becoming and the novels represent their increasing awareness of their selves and identity. They can be considered "moral actors" (11) who are concerned with the inner self. Friedman states that "the lesson" Golding gives in his works "is essentially antirationalistic" and adds, "for Golding, the universe is a cosmic chaos of existence" (14). Golding's characters deal with what lies beyond the rational limits of existence. As a "fabulist" and a "moralist" writer (*The Hot Gates*, 85,

86), Golding argues that a writer "cannot make a story without a human lesson" and this lesson should be "tucked away" in the story (85). He describes a novelist as having a "desire to inculcate a moral lesson" (85) but also knows that the readers do not much like moral lessons. Golding's novels produce meanings, and, as Hynes claims, "in a Golding novel an event must also bear its share of the 'patterned meaning'" (99). In his novels, the author deliberately complicates narrative strategies and invites the readers not to judge but to understand his lesson (a crucial part of the meanings of the novels) in an aesthetic way. Golding notes "arranging his signs as he [the author] does, he reaches, not profundity on many levels, but what you would expect from signs, that is overt significance" (*The Hot Gates*, 85).

Meanings produced by Golding's novels are closely related to the narrative technique. In this investigation and analysis, the dissertation will primarily refer to Genettean terminology and also appeal to Rimmon-Kenan's technical vocabulary and revisions of the terminology. The dissertation attempts to study the novels by Golding because, as Friedman suggests, "his novels have a "persistent theme" (fall from innocence), his "themes and character types inevitably recur" (14) but "he repeatedly invents new forms for his moral vision" (15). As a matter of fact, it is seen that the twelve novels by Golding "display a dazzling array of narrative devices" (Friedman, 15). Although Genettean practical reading and narratology can apply to all narrative discourses, in order to carry out a more profound analysis of the novels, the dissertation has narrowed down its corpus of work and selected three of them: *IN* (1955), *PM* (1956) and *FF* (1959). The selection of these novels is based upon the fact that this dissertation is particularly concerned with narrating agents (narrators and focalizers); that is, it will attempt to investigate certain narrative strategies particularly revolving around the mode of narration (voice) and the mode of focalization (mood). Of all the novels by Golding, particularly these three novels are as much concerned with the technical experimentation as with the theme. In *The Lord of the Flies*, *The Spire*, *Darkness Visible* and *The Pyramid*, technique seems not so important as, or more important than, the narrative technique and perspectivisation used in the novels analysed

here. *The Spire* presents a straightforward narrative, not having the obscurity of *IN*, nor presenting the double structure of *PM*'s momentous story, nor using the sudden shifts in time and mood of *FF* (Weekes and Gregor, 203). *The Pyramid* and *Darkness Visible* mark a new direction in Golding's fiction with relatively flexible allegory. Their "social satire" and "social realism" seem to prevail over their technique (Dickson, 96-97). *The Sea Trilogy* presents a different technique and seems somewhat irrelevant to this study. As for *The Paper Man*, it is different from Golding's earlier work in terms of both allegorical mode and technique. In fact, it is a "black comedy" like *Rites of Passage* [in *The Sea Trilogy*] (Friedman, 159) and, like the other later novels, seems really difficult to contextualize in the framework of our analysis.

The principal aim here is to explore the ways in which narratives produce meaning(s). Henry James suggests that "[narrative] relations stop nowhere and the exquisite problem of the artist [the novelist] is eternally but to draw, by a geometry of his own" ("Preface to Roderick Hudson"). In *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, Wayne Booth states that "the author cannot choose to avoid rhetoric; he can choose only the kind of rhetoric he will employ" (149). Booth asserts that rhetoric or discursive technique is an essential product of any narration, and adds that the author "cannot choose whether or not to affect his readers' evaluations by his choice of narrative manner, he can choose whether to do it well or poorly" (149). It is seen that Booth recognizes the fact that readers will have evaluations to be influenced (or created) by narrative discourse and the author will adopt specific strategies to shape those judgements referring directly to the concept of meaning. Thus, narrative strategies, argues Booth, become the author's "conscious choices" (149) and he claims that they are "relations to be taken care of" (149). These choices, states Booth, are more numerous in fiction than in other genres.

The impetus behind this study is not to devise a new theory but to apply already developed concepts to certain narratives. It is seen that narratology, as "a twentieth-century phenomenon" (Herman, 371), became a center of interest for Russian Formalists, the New Critics, the Chicago neo-Aristotelians and other structuralist and post-structuralist schools of narratology (371-372). Henry James,

Wayne Booth, Bakhtin and Gerard Genette, the major figures in the field, raised some critical questions and developed their own terminology. James, for example, drawing attention to the distinction between showing and telling, stressed the superiority of "scenic presentation" (showing) to mere narration or narrative summary (telling). His motto was that the artist must show, not tell. Wayne Booth, on the other hand, discussed the importance of rhetoric, and emphasized the significance of an appropriate narrative technique for the specific purposes of a certain narrative. He also developed some concepts concerning author-narrator-reader, the most influential of which is "the implied author." "Unreliability" and "unreliable narration," on which later theorists also elaborated a lot, are other remarkable issues that Booth worked upon. Furthermore, Bakhtin's approach is a sociolinguistic approach to narrative. He argues that any "utterance" suggests its "utterer," that is, any narrative suggests its narrator and from the reader's perspective it is impossible to read a narrative without assuming a teller. Bakhtin maintains that the novel is the genre that best reflects the dialogic nature of a discourse. As for Gerard Genette, he also developed influential concepts for analyzing narrative technique. He offered some alternative modes to distinguish between various positions and functions of the narrator beyond grammatical personal pronouns such as "I" or "she." Genette also offered a necessary and useful term "focalization," which is concerned with narrative "perspective." Since then, this term has generated a great deal of discussion among theorists such as Herman, Phelan, Rabinowitz, Bal, Rimmon-Kenan and others, opening up new dimensions in the analysis of a narrative discourse. Rimmon-Kenan, for example, contributed to the understanding of focalization and proposed some sub-categories, which this dissertation uses.

This dissertation, as already suggested, primarily refers to Genettean terminology. Genette has been acclaimed so far on account of the originality of his distinction between the narrative categories of "mood" and "voice" (Genette: 1981 [1972]). Mood deals with focalization ("who perceives?") and voice deals with narration ("who speaks?"). Of course, these categories are also related with the question of "distance," "time" and "narrative levels," which also contribute to the

production of meaning(s). Within this framework, the narrator is a crucial element because his/her narration and perspective determine the way the story is being told. It is also interesting that through the narrator's agency, not only the narrator himself but also characters are potential focalizers that can perceive the events from certain perspectives. In this sense, focalization is a significant aspect of narration, as Mieke Bal proposes. She states that the narrator can be received as a "technical speaker"; and, when s/he functions as a focalizer, s/he becomes an "ideological speaker" (1991: 75). This is the case with all narratives, where the narrators and focalizers play an important role in forming the narrative and contributing to the message to be conveyed.

In *IN* (1955) the author employs shifting perspectives to explore the issue of otherness. The novel attempts to retell the story of H.G. Wells' "ogre" and revises the stereotype of the monstrous Neanderthal Man that had been described in his *Outline of History* (1928). Dickson, drawing attention to Golding's "technical achievement in manipulating point of view and language," considers *IN* an extremely skilful performance, a "tour de force" (28). It is a novel which exemplifies how an implied author can present a world of conflict through a technique of focalization, by which evil and good are shown on one level of narration as no longer distinguishable and what is right and what is wrong becomes unclear.

In *PM* (1956) the author plays with temporality to reflect post-mortem individual consciousness/unconsciousness, though it sounds a bit weird. The novel focuses on the question of existence with respect to intellectual and moral values and time. The narrator, using focalizations, exerts some sort of authority over the presentation of the events or scenes. In this novel, it is clearly seen that the narrative information is extremely regulated by this narrating agent, and the reader finds himself/herself in a very uncomfortable struggle in a reduced realm of consciousness, a position in some ways analogous to the reader's position when faced with one of Samuel Beckett's novels. Not only is time and temporality shrunk in *PM* but also space is strictly reduced; for most of the novel, the setting is confined to a rock in the ocean. The castaway ostensibly struggling on a bare

rock in the North Atlantic, is also an allegory of the reader of *PM*, in the sense that the reader finds himself/herself struggling to understand what is really happening.

In *FF* (1959) the author deals with reconstruction of self and identity through first-person retrospective narration. The novel is similar to *PM* in breaking up the linearity of time, but differs from it in having a first person narrator-focalizer. In this novel, the narrator is seen to attempt to rewrite his own story, and in his rewriting or retelling, the act of storytelling turns out to be a means of self discovery and recognition. Sammy, the narrator protagonist of *FF*, considers "writing/telling" as an appropriate pattern for investigation of his own past. This shows that the narrator, by rewriting/retelling his own story, attempts to compensate for something lost. So, in this novel, rewriting/retelling a story itself turns out to be a theme being explored and proves to be an alternative pattern for life. Moreover, for the protagonist, the act of writing/telling his own story becomes a means of searching for the possibility of reconciliation between the spiritual and the physical. The narrator's nonlinear narration and focalizations oscillate between scenes of innocence and experience; the past and the present. The narration, therefore, becomes a healing and self-questioning apparatus at the same time.

Accordingly, the dissertation, before moving on to the analysis of the three novels, will present a theory chapter, in which the technical vocabulary provided by Genette, Rimmon-Kenan and Bal are explained. In the analysis chapters, the dissertation analyses the narrative elements exploited by the author in order to show what narrative strategies of these elements indicate, and then it will attempt to integrate these findings with established interpretations of the novels.

CHAPTER II

Theoretical Background and Methodology

This dissertation uses Booth's model in order to understand the process of narrative communication between the senders (author/narrator) and receivers (reader/narratee). The model is offered by Booth and generally praised and referred by other theoreticians such as Genette, Rimmon-Kenan, Chatman, Bal, Jahn, Phelan, Abbott and Herman. According to this model, an author produces a narrative discourse or fiction (text) in order to tell some events (story) through a certain way of indirect presentation of events (narration). Any narrative analysis, therefore, deals primarily with the narrative text, which is the sole material to gain entrance to meaning. Once entering the text, the dissertation argues, certain narrative strategies can be recognised. These narrative strategies regulate narrative information and orient the story with a certain perspective through certain narrative elements or devices such as narrators and narrative levels (voice), focalizers and focalizations (mood) and temporal discordances and anachronies (tense).

This section, first of all, will discuss the distinction between mimesis (imitation of actions) and diegesis (narration of events), and between the real historical author and the implied author. Secondly, it will explain the main terminology to be used throughout the analysis chapters, which comprises terms related to narrators and narrative levels, focalizers and focalizations and temporal arrangements.

2.1. The Nature of the Narrative Text: Diegesis and Implied Authorship

This dissertation deals with narrative texts that, by definition, produce indirect presentation of events (narration) through the filtering and perspectivising

of different narrative agents (narrators and focalizers). The analysis of these texts, therefore, needs differentiation between mimesis and diegesis[1] (narration or story) because an illusion of mimesis is attempted in the narratives, and through this illusion, the implied reader is invited to receive the message conveyed.

Genette, an avowed anti-representationalist (Jahn, 1997), turns to the classical distinction between diegesis and mimesis established earlier by Plato in his Republic (Book III). Here, the former relates to the poet as speaker, producing pure narrative; the latter to the character that takes over the dramatic representation, that is, imitation of actions. Wayne Booth in his *Rhetoric of Fiction* takes into consideration the traditional "showing/telling" classification but it seems problematic since "the very idea of showing, like that of imitation and narrative representation is completely illusory" (Genette, 163).[2] In this case, particularly in the case of narrative fiction, a narrative text represents, if possible, only itself or, at its best, only the story it attempts to tell. Barthes, in this context, mentions the term "realistic effect,"[3] which refers to what Genette calls "mimetic effect" (Genette, 165-166), an illusory outcome of the narrator's directing function adopted throughout any narrative. Pincher Martin's imaginary world after death or Sammy's cell experience is a good example for this.

The narrative analysis in this dissertation will therefore attempt to reveal the codes of this mimetic effect, which is created through diegetic performances, and it will try to explain how certain meanings are produced and manipulated in narrative fictions. The critical distinction is not between mimesis or diegesis, but between different ways of diegesis, different degrees of telling, and different kinds of narration. The narrative texts are full of indicators that make the reader aware of the process, in which distortions, aberrations and gaps are also important. Narrative strategies help narrative texts not only create but also hide them. An attentive reader[4] can recognise how narrative information is chosen, organized, eliminated, omitted, shifted or erased in these texts.

This dissertation works on the premise that it is the author who deliberately designs a narrative and has a "central role" in the creation of it

(Tambling, 50). The author tries to involve the reader in the story and conveys a certain message to him/her. Seymour Chatman states that "if all meanings – implicit as well as explicit– are the products of the text's activity, and if this activity always presupposes agency, then we have to posit some such text principle or agent as the implied author" (1990: 90). An attentive reader will see this implied author's hand through the narrative strategies in a narrative discourse. However, in the analysis of these strategies, first of all, a differentiation between the historical and the implied author is needed.

The historical author refers to the real author[5] who remains (and should be thought to remain) outside the narrative frame. The implied author, however, refers to a narrative element, which was first named by Wayne Booth (1961) and has initiated a great deal of discussion since then. This dissertation has nothing to do with the debates over the term, but employs it as it is used in *Narrative Fiction* (2002 [1983]). Thus, the implied author is a textual construct that can only be inferred from the narrative text, or, as the name suggests, it is "implied" by the narrative itself. Wayne Booth conceives of the implied author as "the second self" of the author in a narrative (1991 [1961], 73), which can be thought of as the organizing mind behind a narrative. This construct is "assembled by the reader from all the components of the text" (Rimmon-Kenan, 87). As this study particularly focuses on narrative agents (narrators and focalizers and their manipulation of time, history, chronology, perspective), the dissertation, from this point on, will almost always refer to the implied author, and only sometimes to the historical author.

According to Booth's model, like the real historical author, the real historical reader should be considered to be out of the narrative frame, and an "implied reader" is naturally assembled from a narrative text. It is seen that a narrative not only implies an author but also predetermines its readers, and the implied reader should be thought of as another textual construct. So, the implied author is claimed to "imprison the text by imposing a way of reading" and "a way of taking" the reading material (Tambling, 50).

Moreover, the implied author and the implied reader can be "voiceless and de-personified" (Rimmon-Kenan, 88) entities. Although, it cannot be known surely, the implied authors and readers do not have to be the spokesmen of the real authors or the representative of the real readers. Moreover, the implied author, particularly in the first person narratives, can be confused with the narrator. However, the narrator is a voiced entity (narrative device) within the narrative frame. The implied reader is the one who is supposed to hear the voice of the narrator. But, sometimes, an address to the reader may diminish the alienation effect, which exists in the very presence of the text because the implied reader is not involved in the story. Sometimes the implied author tries to bridge this gap by directly addressing his/her implied reader. For example, in *Tristram Shandy*, the implied author, addressing the reader as "dear reader," attempts to undermine the separation between the story and the author, and, in *FF*, although not very clear, there is a sense of address to the reader. But, in all cases, the diminishing or undermining of the distance is impossible and the real reader cannot fully identify himself/herself with the implied reader. Nevertheless, particularly first person narrators are generally thought to diminish the distance between the story and the reader. However, the question of distance is not simple because different narrative levels and different types of narrator suggest different degrees of distance.

2.2. Narrative Levels and Types of the Narrator

Narratives may consist of different narrative levels. Gaps or connections between these levels are full of implications in a narrative analysis. Different parts of the same story or the same story from different perspectives can be told at different narrative levels. This dissertation, therefore, needs to deal with narrative levels and their suggestions in terms of meaning. These levels create some embedded narratives which may function as explanatory units (flashbacks in *FF*), thematic units (the epigraph in *IN*) or actional units (subnarratives in *PM* where, for Martin, narration as such is a means of keeping on). The dissertation takes into

consideration these narrative levels since all these functions are closely related to the production of meaning.

Different narrators or alternating tones of the narrating act may refer to different narrative levels, which are called "diegetic levels" by Genette (227-8).[6] These narrative levels contribute to the narrative design of the author who seeks to produce a message of his own. For example, *Canterbury Tales* and *A Thousand and One Nights*[7] foreground the act of storytelling itself and make it possible to bring together different stories. In Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, the narrative level at which Marlow (the narrator) is telling his story and the group of friends aboard the *Nelly* (the narratee) are listening is different from (relatively higher than) that of the story itself. The older Marlow is extradiegetic to the story he is telling and suggests some sort of authority over the story. Since a younger version of himself is also involved in the story as a character observer, the information he provides needs further analysis in terms of reliability as well. This is also the case with the first person narrator (Sammy Mountjoy) in Free *Fall*. The third person narrator in *IN* belongs to the highest level of the narrative as s/he always remains external to the story.

In this hierarchical model, there may appear different narratives at different degrees because writers are not restricted to only one diegetic level and it is seen that stories are mostly too complicated to be included within a single diegetic level/frame. Rather, the authors generally appear to complicate their plots deliberately employing different narrative levels, to produce sub-narratives that play an important role in the narrative as a whole. In a narrative fiction, any event essentially takes place at a diegetic level, and in Genette's categorisation, the first degree of narrative takes place at the highest level. Genette in his *Narrative Fiction* states that "any event a narrative recounts is at a diegetic level" and this level is covered by "the level at which the narrating act producing this narrative is placed" ([1972], 228). So, according to this model, the main (framing) diegetic level covers other lower levels. The embedded narratives taking place at the lower diegetic levels are called "metadiegetic" narratives.[8] This technique of "stratification of levels" (Rimmon-Kenan, 91), and various combinations between

the levels and narrators can go on infinitely. The author is free to insert such embedded narratives within another and to organize various degree-level combinations. This stratification, of course, is not devoid of meaning because each metadiegetic narration (second degree or third degree narratives) contributes to or manipulates the main (first degree) narrative or vice versa.

These embedded narratives can have a relation of causality, which, as Genette suggests, explains "what events have led to the present situation" (232). Thus, Genette emphasises their "explanatory function" (232)[9] Conventions of the art of storytelling show that narratives attempt to meet the curiosity of the reader by including such embedded parts. Sometimes they are explanatory flashbacks, where the second degree narration is important in explaining the events. Causality and explanation refer to some sort of temporal relationship but these embedded narratives also retain a thematic aspect and may build up a thematic relationship between the higher and lower levels. Genette states that a metadiegetic narrative is likely to exert a thematic influence on the diegetic situation (Genette, 233). For example, it may establish an analogy (any similarity or contrast) by unfolding a secret, by bringing forth an unknown detail or reduplicating the present story in another context. This dissertation therefore will deal with different narrative levels in the novels under consideration and will try to find out what kind of analogies are made or what cause-effect relationships are sought through the narratives. Character development in *PM* and *FF*, for example, is achieved through such embedded narratives. These parts leave the reader in suspense as to what really happened in the past, and sometimes present conflicting narrative information.

Embedded subnarratives also have an "actional function" (Rimmon-Kenan, 92). Rimmon-Kenan states that embedded narratives sometimes do not function as thematic or explicative units but as mere acts of narration. That is to say, their role is to tell something which may not be relevant to the theme of the first degree narrative. She states that these embedded parts "maintain or advance the action of the first narrative by the sheer fact of being narrated" (92). What is significant here, therefore, is the narrating action itself rather than what is being told. In *PM*, Martin's long monologues play such a role.

The dissertation takes into consideration the narrator's involvement in the story as it is another implicative and suggestive element of narrative analysis. With respect to the level at which the narrator is telling a story, narratives can be classified as "intradiegetic" or "extradiegetic." Genette states that "the terms extradiegetic, intradiegetic, metadiegetic do not designate individuals but relative situations and functions" (Genette, 229). A narrative level can be superior to another one, and in this hierarchy a narrator will be situated at the highest level while the others are at lower ones. Third person narrators, who are mostly invisible or observer narrators, for example, are mostly extradiegetic narrators while a character that takes up some part of the narration is an intradiegetic narrator. If the narrator of the first degree narrative is also one of the characters in the story and if s/he is involved in what s/is telling, then the narrator is called intradiegetic; otherwise s/he is an extradiegetic narrator.

The division between the extradiegetic and intradiegetic narrators, however, does not account for the special posture of retrospective narratives, where a character-narrator tells a story that s/he was once involved in and s/he is also above the story s/he tells. As in *Heart of Darkness*, the distinction between two types of narrative here is in terms of relationship: absence or presence of the narrator as character. Thus, another categorization that takes into consideration the narrator's involvement or participation in the story as character, another tool for analysis in explaining narrative "posture" (Genette, 244), is needed. Genette states that the "[author's] choice […] is not between two grammatical forms, but between two narrative postures: to have the story told by one of its characters or to have it told by a narrator outside of the story" (244). For example, an adult person can be given narratorial authority in the narration of his/her own earlier story as in *Great Expectations* or *FF*. The narrator would speak at an extradiegetic level, that is, s/he would keep the spatio-temporal distance between the present situation and the past, but s/he would nevertheless be a character in the story; or a character narrator may take place at a relatively higher level and tell another story at the lower degree, an embedded narrative, and while doing so s/he will be superior to the story being told but not be involved in that story. So, an

extradiegetic narrator or intradiegetic narrator may or may not remain absent from the whole story.

It is therefore necessary to categorise narrators in terms of their narrative posture (absence or presence in the story as character): the heterodiegetic narrator (absent from the story as character) and homodiegetic narrator (character narrator). In this categorisation, the narrator is thought of as a narrative person and different from the grammatical person (I or s/he). Both refer to different aspects of the narrating agent; the former communicates the narrative situation while the latter indicates a grammatical form. According to Genette, the grammatical forms referring to the person may be deceptive because they seem to stress variation in the element of the narrative situation. The author's choice, therefore, is not between two grammatical forms. Thus, with the inclusion of the aspect of narrative person, narrative analysis and interpretation of narratives gain a new dimension. So, the use of the first person narration does not directly refer to the presence of a homodiegetic narrator, and either a first person or a third person narrator can be heterodiegetic.

As for the narratee, the very narration itself requires and implies a narratee. Genette states that "a narrative like every discourse is necessarily addressed to someone and always contains below the surface an appeal to the receiver" (260). Rimmon-Kenan similarly states that "narratees are as indispensable to narrative fiction as narrators" (104). Therefore, a narratee, either personified in the narration or not, necessarily exists when there is a narrator. That is, the narratee is actually one of the constituents of the voice of the narrator. In other words, as the text constructs a narrator, it also suggests the idea of narratee. Presumably, the narratee is located at the same diegetic level as the narrator but often remains silent in the text.

According to Genette and Rimmon-Kenan, the points hitherto made for the narrator, which are narrative levels and person, also apply to the element of the narratee. The classification that includes extradiegetic and intradiegetic categories, for example, is valid for the narratee as well. Genette asserts that "the

extradiegetic narrator can aim only at an extradiegetic narratee" (260). This means that the extradiegetic narratee takes place at the first diegetic level along with the supposed extradiegetic narrator. The extradiegetic narratee, however, is not involved in the story and, therefore, remains above it. On the other hand, intradiegetic narrators are involved in the story, as listening/hearing characters, and always addressed directly by some narrator (104). For example, in *Heart of Darkness*, the dinner guests aboard the *Nelly* are intradiegetic-heterodiegetic narratees just as Lockwood in *Wuthering Heights* is, with regard to Nelly Dean's second degree narration. As Genette and Rimmon-Kenan suggest, if the narrative contains embedded narratives, both an extradiegetic and an intradiegetic narratee can be seen in the same narrative.[10]

More interestingly, a problematic issue is the confusing of the extradiegetic narratee with the implied reader. This complicates the narrative analysis but Genette tends to conceive the extradiegetic narratee as merged with the implied reader in some cases (260) as "there is always someone off to the side" (260). He adds that a real/historical reader can identify with the implied reader, who can be thought to be "parallel to or identical with the extradiegetic narratee (Rimmon-Kenan, 1983: 104). Theoretically the extradiegetic narratee cannot be the same as the implied reader, but practically it is sometimes hardly possible to differentiate them.

Lastly, from a theoretical point of view, the narratees can be either reliable or unreliable. As Rimmon-Kenan claims, the extradiegetic narratee is "granted reliability" (1983: 104). He adds that without this attributed reliability, "his/her status as distinct from the real reader would be meaningless" (1983: 104). Intradiegetic narratees, on the other hand, can be reliable or unreliable. Rimmon-Kenan accordingly finds some to be the "butt of the irony shared by the implied author and reader (104). This, however, does not mean that the implied reader views the act of narration between the intradiegetic elements (the narrator and narratee) from without.

As a result, narratees are among the indispensable elements of the act of narration, and are important constituents of the voice attempted to be produced by authors. The criteria used to analyse narrators apply to narratees as well, according to which they can be extradiegetic or intradiegetic, or heterodiegetic or homodiegetic. Apart from this classification, it can be underlined that extradiegetic narratees are parallel to the implied reader and mostly regarded as reliable while intradiegetic narratees may or may not be reliable.

The narrator has a critical role in the act of narration and in principle his/her primary role is "narrating" and "directing". The narrator, however, takes on another function apart from mere storytelling: as far as three aspects of narrative discourse (story, text and narrating situation) are concerned, the narrator has a crucial function of "communicating" (Genette, 255, 256). The narrator "establishes or maintains a contact, indeed, a dialogue with the narratee" (255) and "tend[s] to privilege the function of communication" (256). As the production of meaning is an aspect of this communication process, this dissertation aims to focus on the function of communication, which is closely related with regulating narrative information (attestation or denial and emotive gestures in the text), and attempts to raise some questions about reliability.

As regards the question of reliability, narrators and narrative texts are theoretically unreliable because absolute omniscience is almost impossible for a narrator, and mimesis is an illusion for the narrative text. However, an "authoritative narrative account" of an extradiegetic-heterodiegetic narrator, for example, creates a sense of reliability, as in Fielding's *Tom Jones*. This means that the reader is not allowed to doubt the "fictional truth" ((Rimmon-Kenan, 100). Genette states that some of the characters or narrators can be given "the task of commentary and didactic discourse –going so far as to transform such scenes […] into veritable colloquia of speculation" (258). In fact, such aspects of unreliability have much to do with Genette's "emotive" function in the sense that the narrator is involved in the truth value of the events told or the moral stance adopted in the narrative: "An affective relationship, of course, but equally a moral or intellectual one" (256). Thus, the narrator's "testimonial function" or "function of attestation"

is due to this emotive function, and attestation can appear either when the narrator "indicates the source of his information, or the degree of precision of his own memories, or the feelings which one or another episode awakens in him" (256). For this reason, these emotive functions may play an "extranarrative" role (258). Such limitations and assertions subvert in turn the very reliability of the narrator and lead us to the question of the historical author's intention.

Unreliability has degrees and its "signs" can be found in the narrative and an unreliable narrator can leave his/her readers with considerable "reasons to suspect" (100). The signs of unreliability can be identified in a narrative text, which are "the narrator's limited knowledge, personal involvement, questionable value-scheme, and contrasts or incongruities in language (100-103). For example, the narrator in Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951), or Malone in Beckett's *Trilogy* (Part II, Malone Dies), Benjy in the first section of *The Sound and the Fury* (1931) or the narrator-focalizer and Pincher Martin himself in *PM* give the reader unreliable narrative information and present such signs of unreliability.

Furthermore, the narrator's attitude towards the characters may indicate unreliability because the narrator's personal involvement, and emotive gestures such as hatred or satisfaction, call his/her reliability into question. An author sometimes exerts this potential for unreliability for the sake of the idea he is trying to convey or impose. Thus, the narrator's presentation of a character, for example, as unbelievably good or bad, is likely to indicate an element of sheer subjectivity and to function as a crucial device in organizing a narrative and producing a provoking voice as well. For example, different presentations of the Neanderthal Lok in *IN* puts into question the narrator's account (and also the already established cultural-historical accounts) in terms of reliability.

Moreover, the narrator may keep a moral stance and stress the importance of a certain value-scheme in the text, sometimes indicated by running commentaries. The narrator's underlining of certain moral values may also function as a way of drawing attention to the question of reliability. As Rimmon-Kenan suggests, this can even point to a "gap between the norms of the implied

author and those of the narrator when facts contradict with the narrator's views" (101). This gap also remains between the implied author and the real reader, whose views may not conform to that of the implied author, even if s/he is believed to have an authority and omniscience.[11]

2.3. Narrative Perspective and Focalizations

Narrative perspective is concerned with regulating information and arranging the degrees of affirmation (Genette, 161). These differences are naturally expressed by "modal variations" (161), which are related to perspective. To determine whose perspective orients the story is therefore very significant. The narrator's or character's perception, imagination, knowledge, thought, emotions, consciousness, point of view and mindset are mediated through the strategies that constitute perspective. So, this dissertation, from now on, will often refer to the term "perspective" since "point of view" and "angle of vision" merely refer to "seeing" and are inadequate to express such states of consciousness.

The idea of perspective suggests a restriction, and refers to a restricted view of a narrative event or object. It is a complicated issue and requires a sophisticated taxonomy. For example, a narrator may know more than, as much as or less than a character. According to Genette, Poullion or Todorov's "vision from behind," "restricted vision" or "vision from without" can be helpful but is not enough to analyse, understand and interpret the position of the modern narrating agents (Genette, 1981 [1972]:187-188). Similarly, that a narrative has first person or third person point of view does not say much about the narrating situation (as discussed earlier in terms of narrative level and narrative person); it does not say, either, anything about whose perspective orients the story. In this context, for example, Genette (187) questions the classification of Norman Friedman, who differentiates between the omniscient and first person narrators. He examines the former in terms of "authorial intrusion" (Fielding, "with"; and Hardy, "without" authorial intrusion) and divides the latter in two: as the "I-Witness" (Conrad, *Heart of Darkness*) and the "I-Protagonist" (Dickens, *Great Expectations*).

In the present analysis, however, the novels under consideration have no omniscient narration. Third person narrators in these novels are to a considerable extent unreliable and their perspectives are mostly unable to orient the stories. As for the first person point of view, Sammy, the I-Protagonist narrator in *FF*, appears to be some sort of I-Witness narrating agent, as he keeps a distance from Sammy as character. In the term "the I-Protagonist," "I" refers to Sammy as narrator and "protagonist" to Sammy as character. The taxonomy, therefore, does not work in this respect, and it seems to assimilate omniscient narration into third person narration with a limited, selective omniscience. This, in fact, refers to a restricted perspective.[12] From this point of view, *IN* and *PM* can be regarded as omniscient (limited) narrations but the character's perspective orients the story. Even in so-called "purely objective" narrations ("dramatic mode" just like a camera),[13] perspectivisation cannot be ignored. So, all these classifications are not free of problems and the technical analysis attempted in this dissertation needs a more comprehensive and distinctive terminology in terms of perspective.

As has already been discussed, narratives are always received with their characteristic mood indicating a particular perspective through which the story is presented. This dissertation deals to a large extent with the question of mood because the novels under consideration present the reader with complicated structures in terms of perspective. Perspective is achieved through the act of focalization,[14] which "denotes perspectival restriction and orientation" (Jahn, 2005: 173). The term focalization was believed for a long time to have to do with "who sees?" but Genette, considering that focalization is also a psychological, cognitive and ideological process, revised the term in *Narrative Discourse Revisited* and changed it into "who perceives?" (1991 [1983]: 64). Focalization is closely related to what extent and to what depth information will be conveyed since creating various perspectives affects details, directness and distance and therefore meaning.

Focalization is a "foundational process in both story-telling and story-understanding" (Jahn: 2005, 175) because a narrative presents the perceptions of a mind through focalizations. Manfred Jahn approaches focalization from a

cognitive point of view. He argues that "focalization is a means of opening an imaginary window onto the narrative world."[15] According to him, focalizations enable the reader "to see events as existents through the perceptual screen provided by a focalizer" (175). He adds, the windows of focalization "regulate, guide, but also manipulate the reader's imaginary perception" (175). So, the act of focalization helps reflect perceptions, imagery, recollections and reminiscences. Through focalizations, the reader can follow up one's consciousness (thoughts, feelings, even dreams or hallucinations). They have also an operative value in the narrative as they create metadiegetic narratives. Through focalizations, it is also possible to violate chronology, create anachronies, question already given narrative information and thereby ravage reliability.

Rimmon-Kenan, in this context, argues that Genette "considers 'focalization' to have a degree of abstractness" (71). She highlights the optical-photographic aspect of focalization and states that it has a visual sense, just as point of view does, and this sense has "cognitive, emotive and ideological" implications (71). Here, the ideological implication refers to the discussion that Bal maintains in *On Storytelling*. She argues that the focalizing agent is an "ideological speaker" (Bal, 27) which nurtures further implications. This poses new questions about the issue of interpretation and meanings. Bal conceives focalization as "vision in language" and claims that the concept "problematizes the part of visuality in verbal semiosis, which is usually confined to the arbitrary limits of the concept of description" (1991:3). Thus, vision is ideological in itself, also acknowledging a certain way of description, and this very term of description, is necessarily associated with ideology.[16]

First of all, narration and focalization are principally distinct activities. This dissertation, therefore, lays considerable emphasis on this difference and, moreover, on the inevitability of the act of focalization in any narrative. The significance of Genette's technical term "focalization" lies in its clear differentiation between the narrating and perceiving agents, who can carry out distinct activities at the same time. Other vocabulary hitherto offered by the earlier theorists (such as Brooks, Warren or Stanzel) cannot help clarify the difference

particularly when a narrator attempts to convey what a character perceives. For example in a third person narrative, although the choice of the grammatical person is third person –which relates to narrative levels and voice– perspective may not be third person point of view. In Joyce's *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, for example, the narrator is a third person extradiegetic narrator (a narrator-focalizer) but almost everything is seen through one character's perspective (revealing Stephen's childish expressions, feelings, mimicry and thoughts). Another well-known example is Dickens's *Great Expectations*. In this novel, Pip is the extradiegetic/homodiegetic narrator that performs a first person retrospective narration. This first person narrator bears resemblance to the narrator-focalizer (Sammy) of Golding's *FF*.

The language of the narrating agents (narrators and focalizers) does not only reflect the author's/narrator's ideology but also provides it with extra filtering, limiting, selecting and manipulating strategies which allow readers to feel that they gain access to the subjective realm of a character and into the depths of his/her psychology; therefore the "experiencing self" gets involved in diegesis as well as the "narrating self." Interior monologues present a good example and as Genette states "internal focalization is fully realized only in interior monologue" (Genette, 193). Free indirect speeches, which take place within the narrator's reporting or narrating discourse (Genette's Transposed Speech) turns into an appropriate way of revealing consciousness.

Genette classifies narrative perspective as "external focalization or "internal focalization" (189-191). However, he finds it possible that a "nonfocalized" category can be included in the taxonomy of mood. According to his categorization, classical narratives fall into that group. He includes Fielding's *Tom Jones* and many Victorian novels in this category, as well. This dissertation, however, argues that narrative fiction (novels) almost always employs a strategy of restriction, and Genette's category of nonfocalization neither applies to *Tom Jones* and other Victorian novels nor to the works studied here. The very presence of a narrator requires a certain perspective orienting the story. The narrator, when

s/he is an external focalizer, is the one who is looking from the outside and does not tell the implied reader everything that he supposedly knows. This dissertation argues that, for example, Fielding's *Tom Jones* (1749) or Jane Austen's *Persuasion* falls into this category. *Tom Jones* is afflicted with continuous authorial intrusions and *Persuasion* is stuffed with letters and free indirect discourse but their third person narrators exemplify more or less perspectival restriction, and particularly the latter is clearly marked with its limited omniscience. The external-focalizer is also predominant in Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924). Interestingly, Camus's *The Outsider* (*L'Etranger*) (1942) has a first person narrator but uses external focalization.

Genette's categorisation and naming can provide this dissertation only with an umbrella terminology, which needs some revisions with regard to the practical applications here. Some theoreticians such as Bal differ from Genette in considering the possibility of narrative agent as narrator-focalizer. Mieke Bal, again finds external focalization close to the narrating agent and considers its vehicle to be a "narrator-focalizer" (1977: 37).[17] Some narratives are opened up with external focalization or some sections of the narrative may be entirely presented through external focalization. In this case, the narrator tries to tell a story but through a restricted perspective, which means some sort of curtailment, censorship or orientation in what is being told. To analyse this, Rimmon-Kenan and Bal's classification is more appropriate since they extend the scope of external and internal focalizations and conceive of any narrator with a focalization potential. So, Genette's category of nonfocalization, as argued above, is included by them in the category of external focalization and this dissertation demarcates its field of study with these two basic categories: external and internal focalizations.

Restricted perspective is produced by the observing eye, the perceiving and the monitoring mind of the focalizers. They can be external or internal to the story, but evaluating and interpreting the degree of restriction and the mode of perception need further elaboration. When narrating agents take over the act of focalization, they monitor the events while exerting some sort of authority as

identified by Wordsworth in *The Preludes*,who labels seeing (ocularization) 'the most despotic of the senses" (Book X1). This is evident in the classical position of the narrator-focalizer, whose bird's eye view signals the ultimate "monitor-ity" over the story, which is a newly coined term in this dissertation. Thus, in a narrative discourse, the term monitor-ity can be conceived in relation to narrative fiction, that is, the term primarily has to do with the texts telling a story. Inspired by Foucault ("What is an Author?", 1969), Goldman (*A Theory of Human Action*, 1970) and Emmott's "contextual monitor frames in narrative" (1994), monitor-ity can be thought of as a concept complementary to the term author-ity. Emmott's monitoring frame relies on the idea that the narrative text helps the reader "carry forward their mental constructs as a quasi-visual image" (372-373). She notes that the readers "monitor the [events and] characters in the "mind's eye as they read through the text (373). Therefore, "monitor-ity" is a coinage deriving from "authority" and "monitoring," and refers to the authority exerted by an observer/perceiver (namely by any type of focalizer) over the objects of perception. As any text suggests an idea of author-ity, any narrative text, which always presents perspectivized narrative information and orients its story with a certain point of view, suggests necessarily an idea of monitor-ity. Monitor-ity is relatively/more obvious and evident in focalization from without and in free indirect discourse. For example, the narrator-focalizers in *Mrs. Dalloway*, *IN*, *PM* and *FF* also suggest some sense of restriction and monitor-ity because they are remarkably concerned with what is being perceived. In these narrative texts the perceptions of the characters are again mediated through the monitoring activity of the narrator-focalizers.

In many narrative fictions, the readers are presented with the reflection of over-specified and perspectivized experience of a "focal character."[18] According to Genette's taxonomy, the story can be perspectivized by several (or multiple) focal characters as in *To The Lighthouse*, two focal characters (variable) as in *IN*, or only one focal character (fixed) as in *Tom Jones*. The gaps or discordances produced by shifts in focalizations are significant indicators for the interpretation of a narrative text.

Rimmon-Kenan, for example, contributes to Genettean terminology and argues that focalizers may perceive "from within" or "from without." With this differentiation, the analysis of the process gives insight into the experience as well as perceiving it from the outside. This shows that Rimmon-Kenan deals with "the focalized" object as well as the focalizer. The distinction between perceiving "from without" and perceiving "from within" therefore serves to understand better the position of the focalized object in a story, either a character or any personified entity (2008 [2002], 75-78). For instance, Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers* employs external focalization from within (penetrating into feelings and thoughts). Joyce's internal focalizer from within appears in *Ulysses* (1922) in Molly Bloom's stream of consciousness. Biblical and epic narratives, however, mostly fulfil external focalizations from without. The novels under consideration in this dissertation have numerous examples with relatively more evident and more complicated levels of focalizations. In *IN*, for example, Lok's perspective orients most of the narrative. In this novel, not only a narrator-focalizer but also a character-focalizer appear at the same time. Lok is focalized from without by the narrator-focalizer while he is also focalizing the events partly from without and partly within. In *PM*, at the beginning of the novel the protagonist is revealed through external focalization from without but as the novel progresses there is a shift to the character's mind and thus to focalization from within.

Bal, who criticizes Genette's idea of "zero focalization," does not lay stress on "focalization" but on "focalizer and focalized." In her understanding, an external or internal narrator or character may turn out to be a focalizing agent. Rimmon-Kenan refers to Bal (1997 [1985]) and argues that narratives are "not only focalized *by* someone but also *on* someone or something" (74), which means that the act of focalization necessarily entails a "subject (focalizer)" and an "object (focalized)" (Bal, 150-51). It means that "a narrator-focalizer focalizing an internal focalizer that is focalizing an object, a character or an event is also possible. In this case, the internal focalizer is presented as a potential object of focalization. For example, Joyce's Molly Bloom and Golding's Martin and Lok

are both internal focalizers and are focalized by the narrator-focalizers from within.

Lastly, any "perceptible" or "nonperceptible" (Bal, 133-135) entity may become an object of focalization. In this way Bal contributes much to the post-Genettean concept of narrator-focalizer. As can be understood well in this very differentiation, through the focalization process, narrative events are simultaneously focalized by a subject (the focalizer) and on an object (the focalized). Martin's hallucinations are imperceptible objects of focalization. Perceptible objects of focalization in *IN*, however, are perceived from Lok's perspective and coloured by his mind, and are again very suggestive in terms of meaning.

It is seen so far that perceptual processes, psychological and ideological orientations, are achieved through focalizations. Expressions of emotion, voice, belief, evaluative stance, imagery and so on are markers of focalization and these indicators provide the reader with valuable data in terms of interpretation and meaning. Prince's idea of "perceptual filtering" (2001)[19] is very suggestive in this context. James Phelan notably argues that all emotive and perceptual aspects of focalization say something about the character, the narrator and the implied author, and serve to reveal their perceptions, beliefs or emotions, that is, psychological and ideological orientations (177).

Genette finds something to do with the idea of distance in the selection of speech mode and classifies narratives in terms of distance, which, in Genettean narratology, refers to modal variations between the time of the story and the time of the narration. According to Genette, the distance between them indicates a modal variation, for example as seen with the case of inner speech and free indirect speech (Genette's transposed speech), which are more suggestive in terms of producing meanings and deserve more elaboration than reported and narrativized speech. Also, insincere monologues, oblique thoughts, manipulated observation, blurred or contradictory images, and confusing perceptions through different modes can be indicative of duplicity/multiplicity, repression, silencing,

authority or violation of authority. In such cases, textual elements can help interpret the way the narration is being carried out; the use of the present tense in interior monologue, for instance, may have some implications, or dream language operating in presenting scenes from the past or vivid pictures flowing through the mind (of the narrator or character) can be indicative of various strategies, and this technique of imaginary pastiches is part of immediate speech/narration/ representation by which the psychology of a character or ideology of a narrating agent can be reflected.

Accordingly, the spatial status may carry some implications about temporal status, because an internal focalizer can operate only in the present unlike the external focalizer which can oscillate between the past, the present and the future. A narrator-focalizer, temporally and spatially external to the story, most probably knows at the beginning what will happen at the end of the story. This is one of the most common strategies for suspense, withholding information from the text, and therefore from the reader, just for the sake of a "surprising or shocking effect" (79), which stimulate not only an emotive response but also cognitive and ideological responses.

Focalizations also hint at the focalizer's psychological condition and mindset, highlighting the way the focalizer perceives the world around. It may be, in Rimmon-Kenan's terms, "objective, neutral, uninvolved" (80) or quite the contrary. The same object can be perceived differently by different focalizers, all of which also may differ from that of the reader. An object may be presented very positively or it may seem extremely negative from different points of view. Even a slight difference can provide some pieces of different interpretations, some of which may serve to explain some elements of the story while others may reveal hidden messages or meanings. Furthermore, whether any object of focalization is perceived from within or from without has a significant role in understanding how the focalized object changes according to its perception. Particularly, the inner life of a character (a person or a personified object) can be animated by privileged insights into the subjective world due to which the reader can penetrate into the

realm of consciousness or mind. This is the point where estrangement seems completely removed.

As for the ideological aspect implied by focalizations, the focalizer's cognitive traits such as "knowledge, conjecture, belief, memory" are of concern. Tambling states, "events are not describable as such: They are so designated because of the weight of ideological pressure" (7). The way or extent of restriction is closely related to such cognitive elements and is revealed through the act of focalization, which provides valuable data for interpretation and analysis. The external focalizer (or narrator-focalizer) sometimes prefers to restrict knowledge despite knowing everything about the represented world, but when restriction occurs in such cases, the reader understands that it is out of rhetorical considerations. The ideological aspect is referred to as "the norms of the text" and consists of "a general system of viewing the world conceptually" (Rimmon-Kenan, 81). Rimmon-Kenan says that these "norms" are "presented through a single dominant perspective."[20] It can however be argued that they are not only presented but also 'produced' through/by that perspective. So it is hardly surprising that minor ideologies or messages hidden or suppressed in the text will be subordinated to that which is rendered by the prevalent perspective. It achieves this by transforming the other subjects into objects of its own perception. The owner of the dominant perspective, the narrator-focalizer, therefore maintains and reinforces its author-ity/monitor-ity, although the text pretends to have left some place for ideological plurality. The reader, adopting a critical view of the narrative design, will soon discover the fact that authority is being violated by the devices employed to reinforce and bear it. Even this recognition invites the reader to question the validity of this authority, which reminds one of Bakhtin's "polyphonic" reading of a text foregrounding the ideology lying behind the text or ideologies suppressed by the prevalent perspective.[21]

Lastly, despite the fact that focalization refers to a non-verbal process, it will be expressed by verbal elements, that is, language, which is purely the language of the narrator. The act of reading, through focalization, gets richer and thought and feeling are influenced by the lens through which the events are being

projected. The reader experiences various intensities of thought and feeling from the eyes s/he sees through. S/he contributes to this experience as much as does the narrator's voice. Therefore the reader should discover when and how somebody or something is focalized. Verbal indicators such as 'he thought', 'he felt', 'it seemed to him', 'he knew' 'he recognized', which refer to external focalization from within, may help him/her. Some other indicators may signal the presence of another focalizer, such as a shift in perspective, or a shift in space. In addition, names can be considered as effective indicators because they may vary from one perspective to other and be quite as provocative and suggestive as other narrative parts.

2.4. Temporal Arrangements

In any technical analysis of narratives it is seen that time is a "constituent factor of both story and text" (Rimmon-Kenan, 44). Time is one of the significant narrative devices in Genette's understanding of narrative discourse, which is closely related with temporal organisation in a narrative text.[22] Genette discusses both "temporal and spatial determinations" but finds temporal determinations "manifestly more important" than spatial ones (215). His work, therefore, offers significant techniques for handling temporal determinations and relations in a narrative. Through his discussion of order, duration and frequency,[23] Genette provides this dissertation with important tools for analysis of temporal ordering and chronological relations between story and text.

Before moving on to the discussion of narrative time, it would be better to draw attention to the difference between the time experienced in life and the time revealed through the act of narration. However, the problem gets complicated since a narrative discourse or fiction always carries out a specific temporal organisation of its own, and in narratives, story-time (time suggested by diegesis) and text-time (time ordered, organised and determined by the narrative fiction) are different. So, in a reading process, the implied reader is supposed to experience a triple time structure: time outside the text (beyond the concern of this

dissertation), story-time and text-time. Rimmon-Kenan calls the process "temporal experience" (44) and regards a reader as an "experiencing subject in a constant flux" (44).[24] In this case, narrative time (story-time and text-time) becomes part of time as a flux passing through the mind of a reader. Furthermore, as Rimmon-Kenan states, "experience of time may be represented in a narrative text" (44), that is, the experiencing subject (the reader) may experience time as the experience of an object (of a narrator-focalizer). For example, Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* (1927) explores the theme of time experienced, which is not only sensed through the fluent language of the novel but also the temporal organization of the narrative discourse. It is arranged to create a relative sense of time. This is particularly obvious in the shifting tone of the narration from a more psychological time to a more chronological one. The narrator-focalizer in the first and third section "The Window" and "The Lighthouse" foregrounds the time experienced. In *PM*, this experienced time is evident in Martin's spiritual experience on the rock and presents the reader with time passed, time being experienced and expanded time at the threshold of atemporality. What matters in these narratives is not the rigid chronology of the events but the projection of temporal experience on the consciousness of the characters. Beckett's *The Unnamable* is a good example of time experienced with an internal focalizer reduced to mere consciousness.

More interestingly, in a narrative, temporal organisations (or dispositions in Gennette's term), also refer to spatial organisations because what the author does is to create the text itself, which is a spatial entity. Some events are told before or after each other, some events take a short or long time or some occur once or many times. Rimmon-Kenan states that "the narrative text as text has no other temporality than the one it metonymically derives from the process of its reading" (44). So, time is metaphorically sensed through the process of reading and the reader is given the task of recuperating the story-time from the narrative-text which can be full of discordances.

This dissertation is concerned with such potential discordances in narratives (Genette's discrepancies and anachronies). These are particularly

"order" and "duration" as they are the most recurrent narrative devises of time, which also indicate important correspondences to meaning(s). They recur in Golding's fiction and mostly intended to break down chronological sequence or violate story-time by specific arrangement and ordering of text-time with a distorted chronology. The temporal structure of *PM* and *FF* is based upon such anachronies. Text-time, therefore, is one of the most remarkable products of the implied author, whose choice shapes and determines the discourse sequence. Discourse sequence may deviate from story-time or chronology, which is the original sequence of the events in the imaginary structure of the story. This deviation may occur either through analepsis (flashback associated with retrospection) or prolepsis (flashforward associated with anticipation). So, the succession of events is fragmented or interrupted as a result of the author's manipulation of time.

Genette points out the fact that both analepsis and prolepsis constitute a temporally second degree narrative. So, these narrative parts presenting the reader with analeptic or proleptic narratives can be thought of as "grafted" (Rimmon-Kenan, 48) on to the narrative that Genette calls the first narrative. These grafted (in terms of narrative levels they seem embedded) narratives may provide past information about the events that a character-narrator is involved in (homo-diegetic analepsis according to Genette), or about another character, event or story-line (hetero-diegetic analepsis). The implied authors first create gaps, and then they attempt to fill in these gaps in line with their own design. Analepses or prolepses play an important role in the creation of such gaps or in filling them in. For example, Proust's *Swann in Love (Un amour de Swann*; the second volume of *A la Recherche du temps perdu* [1919]) is a hetero-diegetic analepsis. Swann, is only a minor character in the first volume ("Combray"), he is part of Marcel's past life, who becomes the protagonist of the following section, which tells a story that takes place long before Marcel's birth. The narration in *FF*, is almost entirely based upon such analeptic narration of Sammy-the narrator, but this time it is homodiegetic.

Acceleration and deceleration may indicate importance, priority, centrality or unreliability in the construction of meaning through a narrative. An attentive reader can recognise that the more important events are given in detail, that is, in a decelerated mode, whereas the less important ones are given in less detail or omitted, in an accelerated mode. *PM* is a good example of both acceleration and deceleration in the sense that it relates Martin's past in a short time by selecting certain scenes, but on the other hand, all that has been narrated is claimed in the end to be a post-mortem experience and Martin's momentary experience has occupied a considerable amount of text-time. These have implications in terms of meaning because a selective author decides to what extent and at what speed the events will be narrated. Moreover, sometimes the effect of shock or irony can be evoked through these strategies of acceleration, deceleration or omission.

It is also interesting that analepses or prolepses may not be directly conveyed by the narrator. They can be memories, thoughts and feelings stirred up by fears and hopes. They can be revealed through the mind of a character, in which case the act of focalization may help create such effects of foreshadowing or remembering. They can be "filtered through the character's memories, fears, hopes" (Rimmon-Kenan, 2002: 49). Such character-oriented anachronies cannot be claimed to completely deviate from chronology because such memories can be considered a natural part of the linear choronology of story-time. The narrator's deviation, however, refers to more deliberate choice of anachrony and clearly indicates a new narrative level. Accordingly, "the act of remembering, fearing, or hoping" states Rimmon-Kenan, "is a part of the linear unfolding of the first narrative" (49).

As for Genette's element of "duration," it concerns story-time and text-time and deals with the relations between them. For example, a long period of an event (or succession of events) can be narrated, or summarized, in just a single sentence, or alternatively, a number of pages can be given to a period of a few seconds. In other words, the author can devote a short section of the narrative discourse to a long period of the story or a long section of the discourse to a short period the story. The former is called acceleration while the latter is called

deceleration. As regards what is called ellipsis or omission, it can be said to be the maximum speed in narration (Rimmon-Kenan, 2002: 53).[25] On the other hand, the equality between story-time and text-time refers to a "scene." A pure description or dialogue may produce a scene. The description of Sulaco and the illustration of Chandrapore in the first sections of Conrad's *Nostromo* and E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*, for example, presents the reader with a descriptive pause that refers to zero story duration. Similarly, in the first pages of *PM*, just after Martin falls down into the sea to wrestle with water, can be an example. In *IN*, long poetic descriptions of nature, produced by the narrator-focalizer, exemplify zero duration. Moreover, *PM*, and *FF* have a number of the dialogue scenes that refer to equality between text-time and story-time.

Another point to consider in a narrative analysis is the time of narrating and the time of the story because theoretically there is mostly (and always in reality) a temporal interval between the moment of the narrating act and the moment of the story. In subsequent (ulterior) narratives, this interval is clear. Genette states that "the use of the past tense is enough to make a narrative subsequent" (220) and the novels under consideration in this dissertation mainly use subsequent narration.[26] Genette, on the other hand, states that "a relative contemporaneity of story time and narrating time [can be] disclosed by the [occasional] use of the present tense as in *Tom Jones*" (220). This convergence may also appear without using the present tense, as in the last chapter of *Great Expectations.* In addition, he claims that temporal isotopy (a shift between tenses) is more evident in first person narratives (220). Rimmon-Kennan, deals with the same paradox and states that not only subsequent narration but also "most fiction conventionally ignores this duration and treats narration as if it were instantaneous" (90). Yet, according to Rimmon-Kenan, one should come to terms with the inevitability of that duration to "complete the enterprise of writing" (90).

The temporal interval separates the reported action from the narrating act itself even in simultaneous narration, and always marks a difference between those points in principle. That is, the time interval between the moments of narration and story remains disclosed, though it is likely to get gradually smaller

and smaller, and to approach zero at the end, when this interval is sometimes claimed to be zero due to the fact that the act of narration reaches the “here” and the “now” (Genette 215-227).

CHAPTER III

Prevailing Double-Perspective: *The Inheritors* (1955)

This chapter attempts to show how the implied author employs shifting perspectives so that s/he can explore the issue of otherness. Firstly, it investigates the narrative elements in terms of Genettean narratology and tries to determines the state of limited omniscience exerted by the narrator-focalizer who is extradiegetic to the story s/he narrates. The chapter, illustrating levels of focalizations, tries to find out how perspectivisation is achieved through narration. Secondly, it reviews the acts of focalization through the linguistic variations of the narrator-focalizer and the characters (Lok, Fa, Vivani). Thirdly, it tries to find how various focalizations help to reveal the character's (Lok's) increasing awareness of the world. Lastly, considering these findings, it rereads the novel regarding its ethical aspect.

IN tells the story of eight Neanderthals who have survived a big forest fire at the threshold of an extreme climate change at the end of the ice age. The tribe is led by an ailing old man, Mal and his wife the Old Woman. The men, Lok and Ha, and the women, Fa and Nil, share a communal life with their children Liku, a very young girl with her baby doll Little Oa, and Nil's baby, the new one. The Neanderthals essentially rely on sense perceptions and emotions rather than intellectual capability and thinking. At the beginning of the novel the little Neanderthal tribe is seen in their springtime migration from the overhang to the island. Surprised, they see that the log which they have always used as a bridge is gone (Chp. 1). Indeed, this is a sign of their coming encounter with their sucessors, Homo sapiens. This encounter will cause them to suffer and die. By the end of the novel, they will be exterminated by these "inheritors." So, the third-person narrator takes the implied reader to an earlier period of biological evolution, the period of transition period from the Neanderthals to Homo sapiens.

The story begins with the story of this group of late Neanderthals (called "the people" in the novel and this naming implies of the perspective adopted) and progresses through their running into Homo sapiens (the new people) and its disastrous consequences. The implied reader is provided with a patch of history by a third person narrator. The narrator tells a story from the distant past but does not recount the heroic deeds of our ancestors. *IN* questions the myth of moral and social evolution. The novel, therefore, explores the theme of tension between good and evil. The expansion of this theme from the distant past to the contemporary mind is possible because of its universality, which transcends the story to a point beyond temporal/historical boundaries.

IN, in fact, can be read as providing a contrasting story to that implied in H.G. Wells's *The Outline of History* (1926),[27] from which the implied author quotes the epigraph below. The epigraph helps create a very critical gap in the narrative that nurtures further interpretations:

> … We know very little of the appearance of the Neanderthal man, but this … seems to suggest an extreme hairiness, an ugliness, or a repulsive strangeness in his appearance over and above his low forehead, his beetle brows, his ape neck, and his inferior stature… Says Sir Harry Johnston, in a survey of the rise of modern man in his Views and Reviews: 'The dim racial remembrance of such gorilla-like monsters, with cunning brains, shambling gait, hairy bodies, strong teeth, and possibly cannibalistic tendencies, may be the germ of the ogre in folklore… (Epigraph)

IN questions the idea that the Neanderthal man was an ogre and produces a narrative contradicting both Wells and mainstream anthropology. Reevaluating and reassessing the information and data derived from the existing corpus of anthropology, the novel recognizes the fact that the picture of Wells' ogre would be drawn differently if the perspective were changed. So, *IN* is also an experimental narrative because most of the narrative is presented from the other's (Wells' monster's) perspective. Thus the very technique turns out to be part of the meaning itself. Once perspective is changed, the ogre is no longer a monster, but a helpless, ignorant and naïve creature that the implied reader can sympathise with.

Owing to the narrative technique, the implied author provides his/her reader with material for a different view of human nature. *IN* is deliberately included in this dissertation because this novel regards "perspectivisation" as a social issue. Perspectivisation, in this novel, is used and emphasized as a mode of narration as well.

The novel, from different perspectives, reveals both Neanderthal naivety and human fear. As in *The Lord of the Flies*, fear is accompanied by hatred. As argued by Arslan (1997) Golding's novels generally deal with evil in man. *IN*, accordingly, tries to reveal the roots of evil. In doing so, it also questions the idea of development because extremely naïve, sensitive, and content Neanderthals are depicted in contrast to cleverer, violent and alienated Homo Sapiens, who Golding claims "are born to sin" (Biles, 105). These primitive but "good" people are wiped out by Homo sapiens simply because they are not good at inventing tools and weapons and they have not developed an abstract system of language. Their capability is revealed as limited by purely natural means. In other words, as Golding states, they are "not evil enough to survive" and their "animal innocence [is] no match for capacity for surviving at all costs" (106). So, some can claim that this novel explores the theme of "self-destruction" and "the destruction of the others" (Dickson, 29). The novel shows that both are possible from different perspectives. So, through shifts in perspective, the novel attempts to reread the story of the Neanderthal man, and creates a new picture of him from his own, imagined, perspective. Shifts in perspective are therefore both a theme and a prevalent narrative technique in *IN*. Thus, the novel exemplifies how an implied author exerts his/her potential to manipulate the dominant perspective.

As Kinkead-Weekes and Gregor mentioned earlier, the style seems simple enough but its difficulty particularly lies in perspective, that is, the implied reader is placed "behind a pair of eyes that only perceive and cannot understand" (67). Kinkead-Weekes and Gregor also add that the handling of perception is somewhat different from what is possibly expected because it can be conceived of as "a stepping stone to an idea rapidly transferred from the eye to the mind" (67). The

act of narrating is, most of the time, subordinated to the act of perceiving, from the scene where the implied reader is invited to watch when the Neanderthals first run into the traces of the new people to the scene where the new people leave behind the last Neanderthal crouching and crying. The narration is therefore "sharply focused on visual detail of shape and movement" (67). The medium of the presentation, namely the language of the implied author, is purely human and the story is conveyed through a linguistic medium but the implied reader is burdened with carrying out a simultaneous double reading: Firstly, s/he will follow up the perceptions and thoughts of the Neanderthal mind, secondly, s/he will differentiate the narrator's/implied author's perceptions and thoughts from that of the limited Neanderthal mind. So the implied reader is invited to see through and penetrate into the primitive lens and also to deal with a human perspective.

IN, opens up new perspectives, the "primitive other" from within. From the very title of the novel, implying the "inherent wickedness of man" (Biles, 105), irony is one of the significant elements which is nurtured continuously by the narrator-focalizer, who plays a central role as an organizer; but his narration and focalizations burden the implied reader with a task of interpretation and double reading. The narrative structure of the novel therefore requires that the implied reader should be an attentive one and prepare himself/herself for different simultaneous readings, because while following the events from Neanderthal perspective, s/he will also be involved in different levels of understanding. S/he will reread history, sympathize with different sides, experience some sort of tragic irony and review established norms/values of ethics. All these are achieved by the implied author without any commentaries, cautionary remarks or direct addresses to the implied reader. So messages are conveyed indirectly and the implied reader is invited to fill in a number of gaps. Thus, the novel attains its strength through gaps, which, along with strategies of shifting perspectives, serve to raise some questions about human nature also concerning ethics, history and politics. These gaps can be traced at the level of consciousness and linguistic variations between the narrator-focalizer and the character; at the level of the image of the

Neanderthal man offered by established anthropology (the epigraph) and portrayed by the narrator-focalizer from within; and lastly at the level of the ethics/politics of the other, where the novel through its technique of perspectivization suggests an idea of reconciliation.

3.1. The Voice of the Observer; the Perspective of the Other

The Inheritors, irrespective of the epigraph, is a first degree narrative with a third person narrator. The main first degree narrative does not exhibit a complicated time structure and presents a linear development of the events in terms of chronology.[28] The narrator most of the time remains an observer narrator so that the implied reader can view the characters as they are acting. The narrator tends to adopt some sort of limited omniscience in his/her handling of the distant past. It is ostensibly a narrative concerning the perceptions and actions of the last Neanderthals.

The epigraph is included in the narrative frame but it seems inappropriate to think of it as belonging to the first degree narrative level. The epigraph presented by the implied author, in which Wells's attitude towards Neanderthals is clear, leaves the entire narrative in its shade and creates the main ironic gap. So, the epigraph is not part of the narration but it is part of the narrative and refers to the presence of the implied author. As there is no embedded structure in the narrative text, the critical gaps are not detected between the embedded parts but between the epigraph and the following narrative parts, which are presented from different Neanderthal and human perspectives. The epigraph has a critical function in producing and manipulating the meaning.

The implied author, after quoting Wells's biased description of the Neanderthal man, invites the implied reader to observe the events from another perspective and to review this view of the Neanderthal man. From the beginning to the end his/her voice is heard. For example, in the first chapter, the narrator,

just like a camera, monitors the Neanderthals when Lok and his family come to the river across the island:

> The onyx marsh water was spread before them, widening into the river. The trail along by the river began again on the other side on ground that rose until it was lost in the trees. Lok, grinning happily, took two paces towards the water and stopped. The grin faded and his mouth opened till the lower lip hung down. Liku slid to his knee then dropped to the ground. She put the little Oa's head to her mouth and looked over her (11).

Here, the third person narrator presents the implied reader with a scene. The narrator conveys such scenes recurrently throughout the narrative. Unlike the epigraph, such scenes and narrative parts seem to be objective and do not create any sense of bias. Here is a grinning and happy Lok. On the ground, next to Lok's knees, is a little girl with her doll. His surprise is revealed through physical description of his face as "the grin faded." So, it is seen that the narrator is devoted to illustrating an ostensibly objective view of the Neanderthals.

The narrator remains objective even in the scenes where the people (the Neanderthals) and the new people (Homo sapiens) are both shown. After Liku and the new one are kidnapped, for example, Lok and Fa observe the new people and their children from a shelter. The narrator reveals all of them, again like a camera:

> The girl [Homo sapiens] came, hunger-slow, and squatted down about her own length away from Liku. She said nothing but watched her. For a while the two children looked at each other. Liku stirred. She picked something off the tree and put it in her mouth. The girl watched, straight lines appeared between her brows. She shook her head. Lok and Fa looked at each other and shook their heads eagerly (153).

The narrator just describes a scene and it is understood that Lok and Fa share his/her vision. The narrator also monitors Lok and Fa. When Liku eats fungus taken from the tree they are observed to shake their heads eagerly. So the narrator, till the end of the story, tries to create a sense of objectivity and the choice of the third person extradiegetic-heterodiegetic narrator serves for this.

The observer third person narrator of *IN* is an extradiegetic-heterodiegetic narrator because the act of narration in the novel is mainly taken up by a narrator who is not involved in the story he narrates. The narrator is absent from the story as a character. That is, he is superior to and located "above" the story. The implied reader can recognise that the story of the decline of the Neanderthals is retold by a modern Homo sapiens, who not only deals with the earlier ancestors of his or her own race (the Neanderthals), but also their inheritors. The voice of the narrator belongs to Homo sapiens, the implied reader can distinguish the narrator's language from that of the Neanderthals. For example, in another scene, Lok is seen behind the scent of the new people, running after Ha:

> The moon that shone so brightly on the river was broken here by the high buds and motionless branches. The tree trunks made great bars of darkness but when he [Lok] moved between them the moon dropped a net of light over him (75).

Here the voice of the narrator is clearly heard and his sophisticated verbal immediacy is easily distinguished. Particularly clauses like "the moon that shone so brightly on the river" or "the moon dropped a net of light over him" indicate that the language of the novel is a sophisticated language that belongs to a descendant of the new people who have have already developed the human language. Moreover, in some parts, the narrator refers to this difference in linguistic ability more directly. In the following pages, for example, upon hearing the voice of the other (Homo sapiens) on the island, Lok comes up with a picture of the new man. The narrator says that "there built up in Lok's head a picture of the man, not by reasoned deduction but because in every place the scent told him" (77). Here, the words "reasoning" and "deduction" are clear references to the human quality of the narrator.

In the narrative, the narrator's use of the past tense does not mark a distance between the implied reader and the story time. Rather, the narrator takes us into the time frame in which events happen, even though in what historical point the narrator locates himself or herself, by the way, remains uncertain. This

exemplifies a conventional use of the narrative past tense. Likewise, the narrator, in a very poetic style that reveals the linguistic capacity of the narrator, sometimes portrays vivid scenes from nature in the past tense, but the implied reader still acquires a sense of closeness in time:

> The moon rose slowly and almost vertically into a sky where there was nothing but a few spilled traces of cloud. The light crawled down the island and made the pillars of spray full of brightness. It was watched by green eyes, it discovered grey forms that slid and twisted from light to shadow or ran swiftly across the open spaces on the sides of the mountain. It fell on the trees of the forest so that a scatter of faint ivory patches moved over the rotting leaves and earth. It lay on the river and the wavering weed-tails; and the water was full of tinsel loops and circles and eddies of liquid cold fire (43).

As for the focalizing agents in *IN*, the significance of the novel primarily lies in the use of these focalizers. The third person extradiegetic-heterodiegetic narrator is also an external focalizer. Therefore, as suggested in the previous chapter, the narrator will be referred to as a narrator-focalizer. From the point where the narrator starts telling the story onward the narrator-focalizer remains outside the story as a non-participant narrating-focalizing agent and keeps his/her distance till the end of the story. "Lok was running as fast as he could. His head was down and he carried his thorn bush horizontally for balance and smacked the drifts of vivid buds aside with his free hand" (11), says the narrator at the beginning, and continues in the following chapters without participation. S/he is the one who is just narrating the story but s/he also focalizes the events and the characters. For example, in the scene quoted above, "the onyx marsh water," "the river" and "Lok, who is grinning happily" (11) are focalized from without. However, the narrative also contains scenes focalized from within, from the perspective of some characters. In fact, the novel is full of interwoven levels of focalizations.

Apart from the epigraph, the first degree narrative can be divided into three parts according to perspective, referring to various levels of focalizations. It is seen that the novel crucially creates gaps between these narrative parts. These

three main narrative parts are the narrative parts presented from the Neanderthal (Lok's) perspective, the narrative part presented from the human (narrator's) perspective and the narrative part presented from the "new people" (Tuami's) perspective. The implied author, therefore, invites the implied reader to fill in these gaps and to build up connections and bridges between the epigraph and these narrative parts. From the beginning to the middle of chapter 11, Lok's Neanderthal perspective orients the story. After that point for half a chapter, the narrator's perspective is dominant. In chapter 12 Tuami's perspective orients the story. But in *IN*, focalization levels are relatively complicated. As shown before, the narrator focalizes the characters both from without and from within and the characters also turn out to be focalizers in this novel. So, simultaneous acts of focalizations may occur. Between these levels of focalizations, there appear some gaps, which the implied reader is burdened with filling in and interpreting. Particularly character focalizers' focalizations may not make sense without rereading and further interpretation. These character focalizers (internal) provide the implied reader with alternative insights into the perceptions of the characters. In the passage below, it is seen that the narrator-focalizer focalizes the scene from both without and within:

> (1) Down here where the fores changed to marsh and the sky opened over bushes, straggling willow and water, there was no other sign of their passage. (2) The woodpigeons talked, preoccupied with their mating, nothing was changed, not even the great bough where a red-haired child had swung and laughed. (3) All things profited and thrived in a warm windlessness. (4) Lok got to his feet and wandered along by the marshes towards the mere where Fa had disappeared. (5) To be Mal was proud and heavy. (6) The new head knew that certain things were gone and done with like a wave of the sea. (7) It knew that the misery must be embraced painfully as a man might hug thorns to him (194).

Here, in (1) and (2) the objects of focalization are marshes, sky, bushes, woodpigeons and Lok. They are focalized from without and the narrator keeps his/her distance from Liku, the lost child of the Neanderthals, and calls her "the red-haired child," a clear verbal indicator of his/her focalization from without. In

(3) the object of focalization is Lok from within, who senses the "warmness" of the wind. In (4) the level of external focalization from without is reinstated and the object of focalization is closely monitored. In (5), (6) and (7) free indirect discourse of the narrator-focalizer helps the implied reader penetrate into the realm of the primitive mind. So, the novel, from the very beginning to the end, presents a complicated structure in terms of shifts between shifts in focalizations.

Similarly, in the scenes where Lok's investigations proceed and his sensitivity grows towards the scent of the new people, the narrator-focalizer presents (focalizes) the character both from within and without:

> (1) The river did not answer. (2) Lok called again and waited while the picture of Ha became dim and disappeared so that he understood that Ha had gone. (3) Then there came a cry from the island. (4) Lok shouted again jumped up and down. (5) But as he jumped he began to feel that Ha's voice had not called. (6) This was a different voice; not the voice of the people. (7) It was the voice of other […] (8) But the trail of other was simple and not even crossed by an animal's scent […] (9) The other had paused here and there" (76).

Here, in (1), (2) and (3) the use of FID (free indirect discourse) helps focalize the character from within. In (4) there is shift in focalization and Lok is shown (focalized) this time from without. In (5) focalization shifts again and the thought of the character is given. The verbal indicator is "to feel" and Lok's perception of hearing is reflected. In (6), (7), (8) and (9) FID continues and Lok is focalized again from within as the implied reader perceives his thoughts. Here we see how Neanderthal perspective is given to the implied reader, who is made to conceive of Homo sapiens (Wells' modern man) as "other."

The narrator avoids commentaries or other authorial intrusions. Thus, the implied author questions "objectivity" itself through his/her narration. It is seen that the category of "other" is turned upside down from a Neanderthal perspective. The insertion of the epigraph, the use of the dim-witted language representing the naivety of the mentally primitive Neanderthals, the use of recurrent free indirect discourse, that is, the effective use of variable focalization, therefore, refutes the

idea of pure objectivity. The act of focalizations from different perspectives, therefore, can be thought of as functioning as indirect commentaries. For example, the implied author is seen to promote sympathy towards the naïve and ignorant Neanderthals in the arrow scene, where Wells's modern man attempts to kill the ogre with cannibalistic tendencies. As will be discussed in the following sections, "the people's" conception of the world around them is simple and somewhat childish. Their cognitive skills seem inadequate to comprehend abstract conceptions. For this reason, they are presented as thinking with pictures, which also shows that their imagery is fresh and not torn apart from nature. Bones are bones for them, not weapons or accessories. The arrow scene where one of the new people tries to kill Lok, is another scene told through multiple focalizations:

> (1) The bushes twitched again. (2) Lok steadied by the tree and gazed. (3) A head and a chest faced him, half-hidden. (4) There were white bone things behind the leaves and hair. (5) The man had white bone things above his eyes and under the mouth so that his face was longer than a face should be. (6) The man turned sideways in the bushes and looked at Lok along his shoulder. (7) A stick rose upright and there was a lump of bone in the middle […] (8) Suddenly Lok understood that the man was holding the stick out to him […] (9) The dead tree by Lok's ear acquired a voice. (10) "Clop!" (106).

In (1), (2), (3) the narrator-focalizer focalizes Lok and the man from without. In (4) and (5) there is a shift in focalization. Lok is focalized from within as he cannot identify "the white bone things." From Lok's perspective the man has a "longer" face. This is a sign of difference between Lok and the man. In (6) the external focalization from without is reinstated. The implied reader again realizes that the man not only looks at Lok but also wants to prey on him, he is targeting him. In (7) and (8), the focalization level shifts again. The event is told from Lok's perspective. The narrator does not say that "the stick" is in fact an arrow but the implied reader would understand it. The arrow is placed in the bow. This is indicative of Lok's naivety and ignorance. In (9), again from Lok's perspective, the dead tree is personified as producing a voice. In (10), Lok hears the sound that

the arrow made. Throughout the narrative, such shifts in focalizations recur and create constant gaps between different perspectives.

This narrative can be considered as having a circular structure as the novel opens and closes with the human perspective. The implied reader enters the reading with Wells' epigraph in mind and then penetrates into the world of limited consciousness from the Neanderthal perspective. The Neanderthal mind, although it is perceived through the linguistic medium, is illustrated as incapable of abstraction and reasoning, without which it cannot enter fully into language and the Neanderthals cannot, therefore, be fully identified with by the implied reader. Towards the end of chapter 11 the implied reader's perspective shifts from Lok's mind to an objective third-person view in which the implied reader sees "the primitive" from without for the first time as "he" becomes "it" and then turns into a "red devil" in Chapter 12, which indicates a further shift that carries the implied reader's perspective into the point of view of one of the new people. These are the people Wells "sides with in the name of reason" against Neanderthal man. Redpath states that "man at that time was not [such] a degraded animal" (82). The originality of *IN* lies in the fact that "the degraded" is endowed with a power to perceive and provide the implied reader with this perception, although too difficult to translate into a system of signs such as language; and this is what invites the implied reader to ponder over the question of human nature and its capacity to destroy and survive. So, the technique of focalization helps illustrate the human being from a non-human perspective. In the scene where Fa is taken by the branches of a tree out into the water and the tree is swung into the stream, the orienting perspective changes into the narrator's and this, apart from the epigraph, is the most critical shift in perspective in the novel:

> (1) Lok began to gibber again. (2) He ran up and down on the terrace […] (3) The tree would not be cajoled or persuaded. (4) It moved to the edge of the fall, it swung until it was lying along the lip. (5) The water reared up over the trunk, pushing, until the roots were over. (6) The tree hung for a while with the head facing upstream. (7) Slowly the root end sank and the head rose. (8) Then it slid forward soundlessly and dropped over the fall.

> (9) The red creature stood on the edge of the terrace and did nothing. (10) The hollow log was a dark spot on the water towards the place where the sun had gone down (216).

Here in (1) and (2) the character is focalized from without. The implied author is seen to regulate the information about the character and gets the narrator to address the character by name. In (3), (4), (5), (6) and (8) the narrator monitors the scene from helpless Lok's perspective. The very plain description of this scene, in fact, narrates the death of Fa and portrays a tragedy. Immediately, in (9), the perspective changes. This time the narrator continues to tell the story from his own perspective. This scene produces a significant gap here. The implied reader is no longer privileged to see things from Lok's perspective and can have no idea how Lok has felt. At this critical moment, the dominant perspective of the Neanderthal mind is violated. This is the first time that the narrator presents the implied reader with an outsider's view of the physical appearance of Lok: He appears to be "a red creature." So, it seems, he is not like a human being. It is implied that he is different. There is, in addition, a surprising dullness in his reaction to the event.

It is seen that the narrator of *IN* does not play the role of a reliable narrator. The narrator indulges in possessing a limited omniscience and revels in the possibility of playing with perspectives through which s/he invites the implied reader to penetrate into different worlds. It is thus presupposed and implied that a different and controversial picture of the world is possible. The limitation of knowledge in some parts of the narrative, for example as to what is happening across the river or who are the new people, is not due to the implied author's ignorance but to his/her wish to present the implied reader with alternative perspectives. The narrator-focalizer, up to the end of the story, abstains from describing the Neanderthals as "red creatures" and this serves to create a sense of objectivity because they are perceived as "devils" by the new people from without. For them, the Neanderthals are the frightening others coming from the heart of darkness. The narrator-focalizer, however, does not convey a certain and fixed image of the character but creates various appearances of the same object,

which necessarily relies on the qualities of the focalizing mind and its "angle" of vision; the narrator-focalizer thus also shows the possibility of seeing, and also of reading, from different perspectives. Mastering the use of focalizations, for example, makes it possible to view our own ancestors, the new people, as the "other" from Lok's perspective. Thus the narrator-focalizer's playing with perspective adds up to an unusual "othering" process for the implied reader himself/herself. H. G. Wells' image of the other is deconstructed through the image created particularly in the first half of the novel, which calls into question already accepted assumptions about the Neanderthals. The implied author seems to avoid a certain value scheme, whether it is intrinsic in the narrative or not. Instead, s/he attacks such formulations with his technique, which in turn leads the implied reader to question not only the implied author's story in terms of reliability but also other serious scientific accounts. The monopoly of the single narrator (Voice) in *IN* never indicates a potential ideological vantage and source of bias, because the narrator-focalizer, although his/her orientation towards the story remains explicitly emotive, produces a narrative with multiple perspectives instead of exercising his/her didactic discourse in the text.

Their last crossing to the island lets the people face the new people, and here Lok "comes out of his misty egocentrism and has a better grasp of external reality: the invisible smoke of the first chapter becomes a distinct smoke" (Delbeare, 67). Besides, the transition passage in chapter 11 is the crucial point in the shifting process, and it has been acclaimed for its element of surprise. Some find great mastery in it: Delbeare claims "nothing can better testify to Golding's talent than the implied reader's lack of recognition when he is first confronted with the red creature in the transition passage" (70). Up to that point, the implied author has let the implied reader build up sympathy for the Neanderthals by making him/her engage with Lok's point of view . But this shift in perspective "has the effect of undermining our sympathy for the non-rational creature. For the first time the implied reader sees Lok from outside and Lok is focalized from without by the narrator-focalizer:

> It was a strange creature, smallish and bowed. The legs and thighs were bent and there was a whole thatch of curls on the outside of the legs and the arms. The back was high, and covered over the shoulders with curly hair. Its feet and hands broad, and flat, the great toe projecting inwards to grip. The square hands swung down to the knees. The head was set slightly forward on the strong neck […] The mouth was wide and soft and above the curls of the upper lip the great nostrils were flared like wings." (216, 219).

According to this "objective" description, "it" is "an unalterably alien creature, loping away into the forest" (Redpath, 91-92). Thus, "the cool, objective description" and "the unexpected change of tone," Delbeare states, "shows the implied reader how far he was mistaken (70) and it must be strange for the implied reader, to recognise the funny and familiar Lok in that "beast." However, it is also possible to think that the implied reader bears in mind the epigraph, has got to know the so-called primitives better and has realised that although s/he extends sympathy to them, they are somewhat different from him/her.

After the middle of chapter 11, it is seen that Lok's perspective completely disappears and the narrator's perspective orients the rest of the narration. In this focalization from without, the implied reader also discerns a change in the tone of the narrator's voice:

> On the terrace the creature moved faster. It ran to the far end where the water was coming down from the ice in a cascade. It turned, came back, and crept on all fours into the hollow where the other figure was. The creature wrestled with a rock that was lying on a mound of earth but was too weak to move it. At last it gave up […] The sky over the sea turned to pink and then to gold. Light and colour came back. They showed the two red shapes, the one glaring from the rock, the other, moulded into the earth, sandy, and chestnut and red. The water from the ice increased in volume, sparkling out into the gap in a long curved fall (221).

The word creature marks a clear change in the perspective and tone of the voice of the narrator and his voice now sounds a bit closer to that of H.G. Wells heard in the epigraph. That he no longer uses Lok's proper name further distances him

from the Neanderthals. The word creature indicates a hierarchy of being and is a reference to the animal world because the narrator gives up calling him by proper name and refers to him by the pronoun "it". In such parts, the attentive reader recognises the fact that the narrator and the implied author get closer to each other. For example, "the water coming down from the ice in a cascade" indirectly presents the implied reader with the information that it is the end of the ice age, and the creatures are about to decline. Again, "creeping on all fours" cannot be received as mere description of Lok's searching, this refers to his animal-like status, when focalized from without. The power of human language in describing the sky manifests itself. The words "pink" and "gold" cannot belong to the primitive language. The narrator again mentions his/her objects of focalization from without (Lok and Fa) as "red shapes" and they are really objectivised (shape) and perspectivized (red).

3.2. Linguistic Variations: The Narrator-Focalizer and the Characters

The implied reader carries out a double reading of *IN* because the novel presents the limited consciousness of the Neanderthals through the language of the human beings, which is primarily represented by the language of the narrator-focalizer. That is, the Neanderthal mind, which can be considered relatively primitive, is presented/reflected through the mind and understanding of the narrator-focalizer. In the novel, therefore, language variations create a gap between the Neanderthal perception and human understanding of the world. Throughout the narrative, the difference between the languages of the narrator-focalizer (Homo sapiens) and the Neanderthals is clear. As Wittgenstein argues in *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, "the limits of [one's] language mean the limits of [his/her] world" (68). So, the implied reader, considering numerous verbal indicators, is expected to permeate the mind (and the world) of the Neanderthals. As language is our primary medium of entrance into the text and the implied reader is supposed to have the ability of rational conceptualization, as far as language is concerned, both the narrator-focalizer and the implied reader are

different (and more developed) than the Neanderthals and while it is possible to understand and sympathize with the naïve, somewhat ignorant Neanderthals, it is possible to fully identify only with the owners of such developed language.[29]

The narrator-focalizer is the only agent who helps the implied reader enter into the consciousness of the Neanderthals. The Neanderthals's language works upon "pictures" that convey some simple ideas as mere reflections of collective reminiscences or past experiences. Therefore, the narrator-focalizer's language in *IN* is not the language of the primitive mind. Dickson argues that the Neanderthals are "subhuman primitives unable to rationalize" (Dickson, 28). As will be explained, the protagonist Lok's inability to rationalize shows that he cannot develop a language as a sophisticated system of signs:

> (1) Mal opened his eyes. They had to lean down to him before they could hear what he said.
> (2) "I have a picture."
> (3) The three people waited. […] (4) Lok turned to see if he could find what Mal was frightened of. (5) There was nothing: (6) Only a log, moved from some creeky shore of the river by the spring flood slid past them and up-ended noiselessly over the lip of the fall.
> (7)"I have a picture. The fire is flying away into the forest and eating up the trees."
> […]
> (8) "Where are Ha and Nil?"
> (9) "You sent them," said Fa. (10) "You sent them for food. And Lok and Liku and me for food. We will bring some for you quickly."
> (11) Mal rocked to and fro, his face in his hands.
> (12) "That is a bad picture." (45-46)

It is seen in (2), (7), (9), (10) and (12) that the Neanderthal language is too simple to make serious analysis of the events. They feel that something bad is under way but they cannot understand what is happening. As Mal is more experienced than the other members of the band, he seems more aware. Through the focalization from within, the narrator-focalizer reveals in (4), (5) and (6) that Lok cannot reach any inference as to why Mal is frightened so much. For him, Mal's fear (emotion) is sensible but he cannot reach beyond such senses and perceptions. In (4), (5)

and (6), the narrator-focalizer's language is also indicative of the difference between the two languages.

It is the language of Homo sapiens which can make analysis, rational thinking and inference possible. The narrator-focalizer, however, through focalization only reveals the Neanderthals' thoughts and perceptions. This developed language in *IN* serves to perceive the collective primitive mind from within through the translation of the primitive sensations into the language of the narrator-focalizer (and also the implied reader). So, in such parts there is no evidence for analysis or deduction, which is supposed to be carried out by the implied reader. For example, in the above scene, the implied reader can infer that the log, which Lok thinks slid in the stream, must have been removed by the new people, although Lok himself cannot make such a deduction. The thoughts and perceptions of the Neanderthals are always mediated by the language of the narrator and the interpretation of the implied reader, which are also the language and interpretation of the Neanderthal's destroyers.

In *IN*, the narrator-focalizer frequently breaks away from Neanderthal perspective "to add an authorial voice" (Gindin, 31). These passages do not mark direct address. They present and reveal the narrator's poetic language which signals the difference between the two languages:

> The moon rose slowly and almost vertically into a sky where there was nothing but a few spilled traces of cloud. The light crawled down the island and made the pillars of spray full of brightness. It was watched by green eyes, it discovered grey forms that slid and twisted from light to shadow or ran swiftly across the open spaces on the sides of the mountain. It fell on the trees of the forest so that a scatter of faint ivory patches moved over the rotting leaves on the earth (43).

According to Gindin, these are "occasional but necessary intrusions" (Gindin, 31). About these vivid and striking descriptions in a refined language Redpath notes that this sophisticated and powerful writing presents the "physical immediacy of

the world" (in Baker, 34). This immediacy is evident in more physical descriptions from Lok's perspective:

> He stood up and peered over the earth. The river had not gone away either or the mountains. The overhang had waited for them. Quite suddenly he was swept up by a tide of happiness and exultation. Everything had waited for them. Oa had waited for them. Even now she was pushing up the spikes of the bulbs, fattening the grubs, reeking the smells out of the earth, bulging the fat buds out of every crevice and bough (32).

In such parts the language presents the Neanderthal perception and is indicative of their limited-consciousness. When this physical immediacy is put into the narrator's refined and poetic language, it turns into a translation from the simple and amalgamated emotion into sophisticated human terms. According to Redpath, such passages try only to "represent" the primitive perception or consciousness. Therefore, Redpath argues, what is represented or reflected is not the Neanderthal perspective but "an approach to their perspective represented in our language" (1988: 34). As the implied reader cannot enter non-human limited consciousness and such poetic descriptions are the mere translations of what is seen through Lok's perspective:

> One of the deep silences fell on them, that seemed so much more natural than speech, a timeless silence in which there were at first many minds in the overhang; then perhaps no mind at all. So fully discounted was the roar of the water that the soft touch of the wind on the rocks became audible. Their ears as if endowed with separate life sorted the tangle of tiny sounds and accepted them, the sound of breathing, the sound of wet clay flaking and ashes falling in. Then Mal spoke with unusual diffidence.
> "It is cold?" (34)

Such scenes are conceptualized and then presented from human perspective in our language. In fact, the narrator, using the implied reader's language, defines his/her world, not that of Lok.

Furthermore, Adriaens, referring to R. Ohmann, underlines an "epistemic choice" (1991, 46) of the implied author. The narrative technique, attempts to

reveal the irrational through the rational system of language; words/concepts are used to illustrate mere senses and confused emotions or pictures. So, the attentive reader can trace "the very roots of [the] writer's epistemology" through the language of *IN*. However, Adriaens argues, "the first obstacle that arises here is the linguistic medium itself" (46) because language mainly relies on binary oppositions and allows users to see the universe "in certain set ways" but, by using specific techniques and intentional shifts in the structure of language, the implied author manages to illustrate and manipulate the primitive world "linguistically" and too "encode neutral items" (46). These epistemic choices can be detected through the language of the narrator-focalizer, which makes the implied reader regard them as linguistic signs. In *IN*, this is particularly the case with the scenes where the narrator-focalizer focuses on the senses and organs of the characters. For example, Lok's eyes "consider the stars" (40) and his ears "speak to him" (43). Furthermore, what is perceived is personified. [30] For example, the landscape has "legs" or trees have "ears" (47), the fire flies away into the forest and eats up the trees (45), the river is "eager to snatch him over the fall" (41), the sun "drinks up the mist" (47), the cliff leans out "as if looking for its own feet in the water" (65). This strategy exemplifies a different use of focalization, which is not centred in the consciousness but focuses on the sensory parts of the body as if they were conscious. As Adriaens suggests, it is seen that "the senses themselves take over 'the business of living'" (46). This shows that the narrator-focalizer renders the character as "a passive observer of his behaviour" (50). However, the attentive reader will discover in this passivity the primary difference between the Neanderthal man and a human being, because Lok's instincts, bodily emotions and over-sensitive sense perceptions prevail over his limited consciousness. Here the primitive world is presented as being a unified physical body in which there is no centre or hierarchy.

The implied reader is invited to look over Lok's shoulder and enabled to perceive the events from his limited, equivocal and mostly blurred perspective (not blurred for the attentive reader but for the character himself). This equivocating process gives rise to the constant hesitations of the character, for

example in the interpretation of the incidents such as the disappearing log, the smoke above the island, the fire eating up the forests and melting the ice caps of mountains, the arrow shot at himself, the screams of Liku or the very strange smell in the air after Liku is roasted. Like Lok and his people, the implied reader "builds up uncertain, provisional pictures about events taking place" as Crawford states (70) but at the same time these pictures and misunderstandings urge the implied reader into seeing what Lok cannot understand.

Uncertainty is very clear when the primitive language or view of the world is taken into consideration. From the very beginning to the end, the implied reader comes across examples of how the Neanderthals think (or imagine), conceptualise (or picture) and speak (or communicate sharing pictures). They quite often have "pictures" but in their language there is little connection between pictures and words, and also little bridge between words and what they mean, concepts and practice. For example, when Ha manages to lay the trunk across the water they feel very happy and cry out in relief and joy. Lok says, "the trunk is across the water, Ha has many pictures!" Similarly, when they find a stone to cut branches, Ha says "I have a picture of this stone. Mal used it to cut a branch. See! Here is the part that cuts." But, later on the same Ha cannot save himself from the new people because he has no idea as to how the log has disappeared and what the new people can do. In another scene, Fa and Lok smell the smoke rising from the island but they "considered the smoke without finding any picture they could share." They know that there is another man on the island and the only thing they could do is to fear (99). In fact, they smell it and thus have a solid evidence but they cannot interpret it, they do not know what this picture in their mind means, that is, they cannot "read" the sign (smoke). Fear is not a shared picture but a common sense,

> a bitter smell, a dead silence and agonized attention, a motionless and tensed awareness that began to call forth the same in him. Now more clearly than ever before, there were two Loks, outside and inside. The inner Lok could look for ever, but the outer that breathed and heard and smelt and was awake always, was insistent and tightening on him like another skin. It forced the knowledge of fear,

> its sense of peril on him on him long before his brain could understand the picture (141)

The implied reader frequently finds the Neanderthals struggling to bring concepts and ideas together, by using elliptical or anthropomorphic compounds to identify objects in nature. For example, a collection of icicles is called by a Neanderthal an "ice woman" (71) Furthermore Lok's intense and strong sensory contact with the surrounding world is also presented through the selection of a special vocabulary which presents the indicators of focalization and on-going synaesthesia. This over-sensitivity reflected through the language of the narrator-focalizer suggests that the Neanderthals perceive and understand the world through their senses. This indicates that their "lexical sphere of intelligence" (Adriaens, 52-53) is transferred into the realm of senses which is related to the idea of perception, for example, when light is "not warm" or "beats round the clearing" or a smell is felt which is "so powerful that his mind could see it like a glow or a cloud round the holes in the top" (181). Here, the use of abstract nouns and adjectives as "instances of a particular lexicological preference" is also evident (Adriaens, 52). These examples refer to sensory impressions, along with many adjectives denoting visual perceptions, for example, "my hand fits round the thickness" (*I*, 31), "whiteness" (139) or "a very dull red" (177).

In *IN*, whether visual or not, the sensory perceptions can be used to express or convey abstract ideas because Lok's mind cannot process abstract connections by using the concrete qualities of an object, and we build up connections between various sense perceptions and derives useful interpretations about the characters. This is particularly evident in the repetition of deviations from the already accepted verbal collocations, that is, particularly abstract verbs are replaced by more concrete and practical ones. For example, the language may draw the attention of the implied reader to the verb "look" because "ask a question" is too abstract for the Neanderthal mind, while "look a question" presents the way these people communicate with each other better. So, the "expression of feelings and thoughts is achieved by concrete means" and the implied author "deliberately breaks the abstract pattern to point at the basic" and

"instead of naming or interpreting, he describes the visible or auditory reactions of the body" (Adriaens, 57). It is seen that this technique is frequently used in describing feelings (rising hair, tightening skin) as in "he looked a question at Fa" (*I*, 50), "he breathed the word at her. "Honey" (50), or "the hair rose on Lok's body" (80). Similarly, abstract processes are exteriorized and expressed through concrete reactions. For example, fear can be a living thing as in "the fear contracted on his skin" (30) or knowledge can "push into him, displacing the comfortable feeling of after sleep…, breaking down the small thoughts" (173). Again in this context, the principle of "similarity or contiguity"[31] is a recurrent devise in *IN*. For example, a part of the body can stand for the whole (Lok): "he .. moved both ears round" (38) or "he became eyes again that registered (151).

Delbeare argues that the terms ignorance, innocence and intelligence are associated with "consciousness" and, therefore, with language. Accordingly, *IN* investigates the link between consciousness and evil and raises questions about what is innocence and what is ignorance. Golding, according to Delbeare, finds Neanderthal innocence inseparable from their extreme ignorance. Delbeare states:

> Though he has some degree of consciousness Lok remains fundamentally innocent; his "language" is as passive as his behaviour in general and serves at best to convey true correspondences between one thing and another. Tuami, on the other hand, resorts to all the sources of language, including pictorial language, not only to describe the world and himself but to explain and justify them. He is the storyteller, the liar, the mythmaker" (Delbeare, 73).

The Neanderthals, although very limited, have consciousness and can differentiate between what is bad and what is good. So Neanderthal innocence does not refer to a complete lack of consciousness as in a baby or an animal. The Neanderthals are innocent, when compared with the new people. They cannot adapt themselves to new conditions and cannot understand the changing world. Neanderthal innocence or ignorance is reflected through their language: for example, in the scene given earlier and its continuation:

> His [Ha's] right hand found a stone and picked it up. He showed it to the people.
> "I have a picture of this stone. Mal used it to cut a branch. See!. Here is the part that cuts."
> […]
> He held up the stone, miming Mal cutting a branch. The stone is a good stone," said Lok. "It has not gone away. It has stayed by the fire until Mal came back to it." (31)

It is seen that they are unable to make tools just since they do not have a sophisticated language. They personify their own organs (the narrator-focalizer well reflects this tendency in "the right hand found a stone"). They do not try to control nature, but simply it as it is, as seen in the stone. They do not give shape to it but use it as it is. So, in the case of the Neanderthals, the implied reader can see, from his/her Homo sapiens's perspective, that they are not animal but "animal-like" (Delbeare, 73-74). Through focalizations from within it is possible to re-create an image of the Neanderthal man and investigate what he/it is.

3.3. From Naivety to Awareness: Splitting of the Perception

It has already been argued that *IN* is a novel of gaps that burden the implied reader with a work of double-reading. In the previous section, it was shown that the narrator-focalizer draws the implied reader's attention to linguistic variation apparent in the ability of conceptualization of the Neanderthals and Homo sapiens. In this section, from the Neanderthal perspective, the implied reader is invited to view how the Neanderthals perceive the world and how Lok's increasing awareness is illustrated throughout the narrative. Lok's inability to analyse, this time, causes him to suffer from split perception and misunderstanding.

The technique of focalization burdens the implied reader with constructing the character by piecing together fragmented information because the implied reader sometimes should follow pictures from the awkward and dull Neanderthal mind, and synthesise them into a coherent whole. This process helps him/her

develop a sympathy for Lok and the others, but as Redpath argues it is not "the sympathy of one human being for another but "for the suffering of an animal" (Redpath, 1988, 33). Redpath's remarks sound like an overstatement because the narrative strategy craftily conceals the non-human, animal-like identity of the creature until chapter 11. However, this does not mean that the Neanderthals can easily be conceived as human, even though they are endowed with some moral qualities.

From a different perspective, the narrator-focalizer reveals that the Neanderthal mind cannot judge the things around it without referring to nature. Lok is seen to attempt judgements by using natural elements. His realm of consciousness is restricted to sense perceptions because "he has not yet structured his world of experience; there is no clear-cut distinction between his subjective and objective world" (Adriaens, 51). The following quotation illustrates how the narrator-focalizer reveals the Neanderthal process of perceiving:

> (1) Lok squatted to one side and (2) looked out over the dark waters. (3) There had been no conscious decision but he was on watch. (4) He yawned too and (5) examined the pain in his belly. […] (6) Fa was within reach and (7) suddenly he desired her again; but his desire was easy to forget because most of his mind preferred to think about food instead. (8) He remembered the hyenas… […] (9) Miles of darkness and sooty blots starched away to the grey bar that was the sea; nearer, the river shone dispersedly in swamps and meanders. (10) He looked up at the sky […] (11) As he watched and the after image of the fire faded, he saw a star prick open […] (12) His eyes considered the stars without blinking while his nose searched for the hyenas. (*I*, 39-40)

Here in (1) there is focalization from without. In (3) the narrator-focalizer focalizes the character's mind and points to the fact that it is hardly possible for Lok to reach a conscious decision. Therefore, Lok is seen to address nature, in (2) and (3): He is "on watch." In (4) there is a sign of dullness and confusion (yawning). In (5), (6), (7) and (8) it is suggested that this man is different than the monstrous creature portrayed in the epigraph: he is meek, naïve and also cowardly. His address to nature goes on in (10), (11) and (12). For human beings,

consciousness is the central point of reference to make judgements and statements about distance, size or closeness. For the Neanderthals, however, it seems that Nature is a point of reference to express their emotions.

As presented in this novel, the early Neanderthal life was a stable one with easy and possible judgements; they could "sleep by the falling water" for example, and nature never surprised them, the water "would not go away" (22). Therefore, the Neanderthal philosophy of time can be summarised as "today is like yesterday and tomorrow" (90). Once this sense of security is disturbed, time is no longer a "frozen" entity, and references to the bitterness of the winter and other references to climactic changes indicate the ending of an ice-age (Chp.I) that is, their life is changing and nothing will remain the same.

Through the limited and blurred lens of the character-focalizer Lok, it is also seen that the Neanderthals are amiable, pure, naïve and funny. This is evident, for example, in the scene where Lok and the people are focalized from without, while trying to get across the river:

> Liku took the little Oa from her mouth, and rubbed her mop of red curls against Lok's thigh.
> "I will go with Lok."
> This lit a kind of sunshine in Lok's head […] He saw Fa laughing back at him and Ha smiling gravely. Nil called out to them.
> "Be careful, Liku. Hold tight."
> […]
> Lok went right back to the trail under the beeches. He scowled at the water, rushed at it, then skidded to a stop. Across the water the people began to laugh. […] Even Mal grinning at that. Liku's laughter had reached the silent, breathless stage, and the water was falling from her eyes. Lok hid behind a beech tree and Nil held her breasts for laughter (19-20)

Neanderthal reverence for life is obvious in their reverence for the earth mother Oa, the goddess of the earth giving birth to all things. This is an idea corresponding to the unity in the "yesterday-today-tomorrow" pattern, which shows that their world is also spatially cyclical and self-contained. Their universe is closed upon itself, as in their attitude towards the death of Mal. The people

think that “he [Mal] gets from Oa’s belly [and will turn] back to Oa’s belly” (I, 91).They follow the course of nature in passivity, without any resistance against nature and the outside world. Therefore the implied reader cannot see a “subject-object” antagonism because their life is a collective life just as their mind is a collective mind exemplified in their frequent sharing of pictures, the collective sexuality between Nil, Lok, Fa and Ha, the joy of a big family with no fighting or guilt.

The implied reader also recognizes the fact that the Neanderthals are also warm, attractive and helpful. The narrator-focalizer, without any authorial intrusion, reveals this in the scene where Mal falls into the water and starts to tremble and quiver since he is cold:

> The people gathered round in a tight little group. They crouched and rubbed their bodies against him, they wound their arms into a lattice of protection and comfort. The water streamed off him and left his hair in points. Liku wormed her way into the group and pressed her belly against his calves. Only the Old woman still waited without moving. The group of people crouched round Mal and shared his shivers (21).

In this scene, the reader is encouraged to note that although these people cannot be considered monstrous ogres, they still look somewhat animal-like. The narrator-focalizer’s account, therefore, not only promotes sympathy for the Neanderthals but also underlines their difference from human beings.

The reader realizes this difference clearly in their lacking any capacity for invention. In order to invent something, as in building a bridge or boat, knowledge needs to be accumulated. The Neanderthals, however, cannot remember consecutive steps, as they mostly lack the ability to see cause-effect relationships between events. It is seen that the people know of fire, for example, but they have to carry it with themselves (*I*, 33); they have not learned how to create it. They can use stones to cut branches (31) or they can produce simple toys like Liku’s baby doll, the little Oa (19). The implied reader, as Gindin notes, thinks that “they generally have little capacity as incipient engineers or organizers of the exterior

world" (33). It is also suggestive that they can sometimes remember past pictures/experiences but are unable to invent new ones. Homo sapiens, on the contrary, has the capacity to invent and utilize; the new people use mechanics for good and bad ends such as arrows (a present from Lok's perspective) or boats (just hollow logs for Lok). The novel also suggests that Homo sapiens "must" invent and change, otherwise they know they will die out like the Neanderthals. They are in progress and do not conceive of time as "today is like yesterday and tomorrow." So, the implied reader feels sympathy for the naïve, innocent Neanderthals but on the other hand, as Redpath argues, s/he is invited to think that "man must keep moving, progressing, and changing" (1988, 38). Redpath states,

> to be innocent one must be morally aware of the possibility of being guilty; one must be aware of the existence of the choice between guilt and innocence […] The Neanderthalers do not have the choice and therefore cannot be innocent in human terms. They are not guilty either. They are simply 'other'" (1988: 38).

The Neanderthals' constant attempt to construct their world from senses and pictures illustrates the process of their thinking: First they perceive, and then remember, and then use rudimentary verbalisation. It is seen in this novel that such perceptions are mostly put into language through the language of the narrator-focalizer. So, a difficulty in "summoning a picture into stable experience like speech" (Gindin, 33) arises. For example, the narrator-focalizer presents the implied reader with this process in many scenes:

> The scents were a pattern in space and time […] Below it was a company of smells, smells of sweat and milk and the sour smell of Mal in his pain. Lok sorted and discarded these [smells] and settled on the last smell of Ha. Each smell was accompanied by a picture more vivid than memory, a sort of living but qualified presence, so that now Ha was alive again. He settled the picture of Ha in his head, intending to keep it there so that he would not forget (74).

The novel recombines the moral qualities with the insistence on the primitive mind's intellectual limitations. These creatures have a deep and humble

sense of their own limitations, as well as a faith in a female divine power (Oa) and in the goodness of the earth. The narrator-focalizer, until mid-chapter 11 tries to illustrate

> a model of the Neanderthal mind; the most significant feature of that mind is that it cannot conceive of relationships, and we might take this as a tentative definition of innocence: man cannot sin until he can both remember and anticipate (Hynes, 18-19).

Their innocence is particularly seen in their "reverence for life." They do not kill for meat but they feel free to approach a carcase of an animal killed by predators, and do not draw back from eating grubs. In this scene, the implied reader is presented with the focalization of the Neanderthal wilderness from without. For the implied reader, however, the scene necessarily creates a sense of disgust and violence particularly in (1), (2), (3), (4) and (5) below. The implied author again tries to undermine the image of Well's ogre but at the same time stresses the non-human difference:

> Fa began to lug at the doe, then cried out in anger at the hyenas. Lok backed to her, bent down, seized the doe by the leg. He began to drag the body heavily towards the gully, brandishing the thorn bush the while […] He began to pound at the body, (1) braking out the joints. (2) Fa was grunting with excitement. Lok talked as (3) his great hands tore and twisted and snapped the sinews. All the time the hyenas ran to and fro. The birds drifted in and settled on the rock opposite Liku so that she slithered down to Lok and Fa. The doe was wrecked and scattered. (4) Fa split open her belly, slit the complicated stomach and spilt the sour cropped grass and broken shoots on the earth. Lok beat in the skull to get at the brain and levered open the mouth to wrench away the tongue […] Liku crouched by the doe eating the piece of liver that Fa had given her. […] (5) [Fa] suck the blood. Yet there was a kind of darkness in the air under the watching birds (53-54)
>
> "This is bad. But a cat killed you so there is no blame" (54)

Lok's further excuse indicates a moral reasoning: "This is very bad. Oa brought the doe out of her belly…The meat is for Mal who is sick" (56). Nevertheless, in

this highly naturalistic scene, something contradicting the established image of the Neanderthals can be found. The novel again overturns expectations, and the implied reader views the "grunting" primitives in a different context, which presents the implied reader with the clues to the potentials of the primitive. Similarly, the cannibalistic tendency of Homo sapiens is portrayed in the scene where Liku is sacrificed, where this time Liku is like an animal in the eye of human beings. In both cases, it is implied that deer and Liku serve good: the physical health of the people and the psychological security of the new people.

The chapters 1, 6 and 10 are important in terms of increasing awareness and reinforcement. Delbeare notes that Lok and Fa's crossings are done with a "swinging movement" and this "turns into an organizational device" in *IN* (62). Delbeare adds, "each crossing is followed by a fall and more difficult than the one before" (69). The first crossing in chapter 1 ends up in Mal's illness and then his death, without understanding what is going to happen. This is symbolic of the Neanderthal's inability to bridge and adapt. From Neanderthal perspective water is "deadly" and is "trickling from the ice woman's belly" (28). Lok "ignored the unvisited island and the mountain beyond it on the other side of the gap" because he "remembered how safe the terrace was" (29). The narrator suggests that they feel something strange getting closer as the ice capped mountain is melting but they cannot understand. They know that things changed but they cannot explain why:

> Now Mal spoke. […] They listened to him in silence. They waited for more, for all that Mal knew. There was the picture of the time when there had been many people, the story that they all liked so much of the time when it was summer all year round and the flowers and fruit hung on the same branch. There was also a long list of names that began at Mal and went back choosing always the oldest man of the people at that time: but now he said nothing more. Lok sat between him and the wind (35).

From Lok's perspective, the implied reader understands that the Neanderthals cannot analyze their sense perceptions into clear concepts and ideas but only receive them as pictures, thinking in a kind of "amalgamated metaphor"

(Gindin, 31) as discussed earlier. This accounts for the reason why the Neanderthal Lok is not capable of conceptualising himself as an integrated individual self. In this context, Lok's splitting himself into an inside and an outside (Lok-other), as if the two had no connection is a good example:

> There built up in Lok's head a picture of the man, not by reasoned deduction but because in every place the scent told him –do this! […] now the scent turned Lok into the thing that had gone before him. He was beginning to know the other without understanding how it was that he knew. Lok-other crouched at the lip of the cliff and stared across the rocks of the mountain (77).

After detecting the trail of the other (Homo sapiens), which is simple and not crossed by an animal scent, Lok sees the other for the first time, and this experience of seeing splits him into an inner-Lok and an outer-Lok. He cannot be like the old Lok any more, but also cannot build up a new one. The Lok-other feels "unutterably alone" (82). Fear plays an important role again, it

> was not a shared picture but a general sense, a bitter smell, a dead silence and agonized attention, a motionlessness and tensed awareness that began to call forth the same in him. Now, more clearly than ever before, there were two Loks, outside and inside. The inner-Lok could look for ever. But the outer breathed and heard and smelt and was awake always, was insistent and tightening on him like another skin. It forced the knowledge of fear, its sense of peril on him long before his brain could understand the picture (141)

As Lok-other penetrates into the world of the other, ironically, he discovers likeness: "Lok discovered 'Like' He had used likeness all his life without being aware of it… Now in a convulsion of the understanding Lok found himself using likeness as a tool as a stone" (194). This means that he "bridges the two worlds with 'like'" (Delbeare, 68). His discovery is very significant because he understands "how creatures are both like and unlike each other" (Gindin, 35) In another scene when the old woman cannot recognise Lok on the tree, Lok is frightened because he thinks that

> He was cut off and no longer one of the people; as though his communion with the other had changed him he was different from them and they could not see him. He had no words to formulate these thoughts but he felt his difference and invisibility as a cold wind that blew on his skin (78).

This is another point at which Lok comes to terms with what otherness is. So, the discovery of likeness and difference indicates that Lok's awareness is improving. Also the tenth chapter can be read as taking Lok to the very threshold of the state of humanity, at which the implied reader will remember chapter 5 bringing Lok to the water and where he perceives that the new people are carrying their logs/boats along the trail, which is a new situation that the primitive mind is unable to understand. Today is not like yesterday and tomorrow is uncertain, outer-Lok's present experience therefore cannot be explained by the past pictures and reminiscences of the inner-Lok; and, particularly with the interference of the new people into their secure and stable life, the Neanderthals lose their point of reference: "There was smoke on the island, there was another man on the island, there was nothing in life as a point of reference" (99).

It is understood that the new people sail along the shores because they are pursued by the men of Vivani's husband, who has been kidnapped by the chief of the community, Marlan, and for this reason they are always on the move, but in a linear way, not cyclically. Their linear movement is mostly due to their individual choices, but the Neanderthals' cyclical movement was due to natural causes such as climate. In crossing to the island, Lok and Fa break the limits of their ordinary/secure cyclical path and encounter the new people. Towards the end of the novel, Lok and Fa's stumbling minds, with underdeveloped intellectual faculties, perceive the new people from the summit of a dead tree. This strikingly refers to the overturned hierarchy of seeing (seeing from above) and presents us with an extended metaphor for the narrative technique of focalization. These monitoring scenes also make the implied reader perceive himself (his own humankind) from without. From the top of a dead tree, the people study the behaviour of the new people, who have a camp below:

> He was looking slightly up and his head was turning from side to side. Behind him the laugh-noises began again. Little by little they took his attention though the posture and grin of strain stayed in his body. There were many laugh-noises as though the new people had gone mad (110).

From this unusual viewpoint or vantage point, they witness a violent and bloody ritual of the body, dirt, eating, drinking, and sexuality. The new people are perceived as "shouting, laughing, singing" and "the flames of their fire" are seen as "leaping madly with them" (170). The light of the fire is not perceived as "warm" but "fierce," and from Lok's perspective these people are "like the fire made of yellow and white" (171). The implied reader understands that the things that Lok perceives as "round stones" are the cups for drinking: "His nose caught the scent of what they drank. It was sweeter and fiercer than the other water, it was like the fire and the fall. It was a bee-water, smelling of honey […] It frightened and excited like the people themselves" (172). The implied reader's view is again duplicated here because s/he views two sides from a single perspective. On the one hand, for example, the implied reader watches the new people drinking, which does not help them forget about their fear of the red devils, on the other hand s/he monitors the primitive consciousness busy with a mysterious "honey" (drink) to be inherited from the new people. The free indirect discourse reveals the mind of Lok who thinks that they are different and infers that "Oa did not bring them out of her belly" (173). The difference is also evident in their teeth which are small with two being longer than the others:

> Lok peered through the leaves again for the meaning of the words and he was looking straight at the fat woman's mouth. She was coming towards the tree, holding on to Tuami, and she staggered and screeched with laughter so that he could see her teeth. They were not broad and useful for eating and grinding; they were small and two were longer than the others. They were teeth that remembered wolf." (173-4).

The wolf-like image of Homo sapiens makes it possible to face a different view of the human being: the predator. These new people are more alienated from nature

both spiritually, as in betrayal, hatred and jealousy between Marlan, Tuami and Vivani, and physically, as in the scene where Tanakil's stomach does not accept the thorny bushes that Liku eats. There is sexual orgy in this male dominated society, which is experienced while drunken and is not the expression of peace or affection but of distress and violence. From Lok's perspective Tuami and Vivani's sexual encounter is a "fierce and wolflike battle" in which "they had fought it seemed against each other, consumed each other rather than lain together so that there was blood on the woman's face and the man's shoulder" (176). This society, as far as the implied reader can hear through focalization is full of noise, fight and anger. The affair of Vivani and Marlan and Tuami's plotting against the chief of the society and having violent sex with Vivani show that it is also a community of betrayal arising from the setting of self against community. Their violent sex and totemic stag play an important role, because they account for the need for blood to soothe the inner desires for violence against the fearsome other, which is conceived as the source of darkness.

The idea of "the predatory other" culminates in the ritual sacrifice of Liku by the new people when their hunt is a failure, where the cannibalistic tendencies of the new people and the evil inside them are illustrated. The cannibalistic implications of the scene is clear but it is also possible to think that the human beings do not eat "their own kind, they eat other" (Redpath, 1988: 36). On the contrary, it is the Neanderthals whose practice can be considered cannibalistic and "necrophagous" (Redpath, 36). The Neanderthals are said to have eaten before "the brains and marrows of their dead comrades like the ailing Mal, who ironically warns his companions not to open his head: "You would only taste weakness." A savagely unpleasant looking scene given above, the narrator-focalizer's apparently objective portrayal of their eating of the carcass of a deer, extends such implications. In that scene they are portrayed as eating brains and wrenching away the animal's tongue or sucking the blood in an unattractive, animal-like way (*IN*, 53-54).

Once the fear of the "unknown," the "other" is recognised, the labelling of human-like motives as purely evil is difficult. At the end of the novel, the implied

reader witnesses that the new people are also trying to escape from the Neanderthals. They have attempted to kill them because they really fear those animal-like red creatures. They (the new people) do not know anything about these creatures (the people) and think of them as embodying evil spirits. Therefore they hold, for example, exorcist stag rituals to expel the curse of these creatures.

Particularly the scene, where Vivany (a female member of the new people) and the New One (the Neanderthal baby kidnapped by the new people) are pictured together, presents a remarkable example. The implied reader perceives the scene when Vivani is revealed as breast-feeding the little fearsome "red devil" and shares Vivani's experience that represents the mixture of her feelings, fear and love, hesitation and compassion, anxiety and affection:

> (1) He [the new one] sniffed, turned, ran at Vivani's leg and scrambled up to her breast. (2) She was shuddering and laughing (3) as if this pleasure and love were also a fear and torment. (4) The devil's hands and feet had laid hold of her. (5) Hesitating, half-ashamed, with that same frightened laughter, (6) she bent her head, cradled him with her arms and shut her eyes. (7) The people were grinning at her too (8) as if they felt strange, tugging mouth, as if in spite of them (9) there was a well of feeling opened in love and fear (231).

This is one of the most striking scenes presented by the narrative. This scene clearly deconstructs the epigraph and Well's clear-cut formulations regarding the Neanderthal man as mere "monster". Thus, the circular structure of the novel is achieved by the inclusion of this scene but this time the human perspective, although understanding the fear of the encounter with the other, does not deny the possibility of reconciliation. In (9) the implied reader manifests himself/herself with the use of a metaphor ("well" of feeling) in which love and fear should be amalgamated. In (1) the narrator-focalizer focalizes the Neanderthal baby from without. Since, he refers to him as "he," the implied reader understands that he does not consider him a devil. In (2) it is difficult to decide whether the character is focalized from without or from within. If the words are taken as mere physical responses, they are possibly focalized from without. But, nevertheless, they reflect

Vivani's confusions inside, terror and compassion together, which is evident in (3). Vivani feels the mixture of feelings, both fear and love, hesitation and compassion or anxiety and affection. Without understanding and confronting this fear, it seems difficult to explore the ways of reconciliation. The novel, therefore, points to the hope of physical, rational and moral reconciliation in this scene where physical and psychological symbiosis between the new One and Vivani unites the mother and the other. In (4) the narrator focalizer refers to how the new born is perceived. For Vivani, the Neanderthal baby is still a devil, which reminds us of Wells again. But, this time the devil is not rejected even if the woman hesitates and is half-ashamed. Here, the implied reader's stress on "shame" has ethical, cultural and political interpretations. The scene describes the social pressure on those who get in touch with the other. Vivani feels ashamed because she attempts to build up a connection with the Neanderthal baby. In (6) the scene reaches the climax of her emotional confusion: She shuts her eyes. She cuts ties with the outside and turns to facing her own fear and hatred inside. Also, in (7) there is social resistance or defence mechanism as in the form of laughter. In (8) the focalization of the new people around from within reveals how strange they feel when the other touches them. The implied reader, too, feels strange and identifies with Vivani. Nevertheless, the novel suggests, reconciliation is possible and there is hope.

Besides Lok, Tuami is also a developing character, who exhibits the human potential for good, for creativity and self-criticism although seen as wolf-like from Lok's perspective. Tuami is a character overturning the structure of the text by combining two sides of the good/bad dichotomy into an individual existence. Tuami tries to develop a vision of wholeness, as the novel and its technique of focalization invites us to reproduce a united view out of different perspectives:

> Holding the ivory firmly in his hands, feeling the onset of sleep, Tuami looked at the line of darkness. It was far away and there was plenty of water in between. He peered forward past the sail to see what lay at the other end of the lake, but it was so long, and there was such a flashing

> from the water that he could not see if the line of darkness had an ending (233).

That he searches for the light beyond the line of darkness indicates a change in him and reflects the possibility of light (good) in his artistic nature.

Through Lok's limited consciousness, the implied reader recognises the possibility of "likeness in the other" or and in the "other" s/he experiences some qualities that make us human. S/he shifts from Wells' epigraph into a fantastic world, where there is hesitation between explanations, things are half-comprehended and barely ordered. Sympathy and understanding arise, but, s/he nevertheless views the Neanderthal mind both from without and within. The implied reader monitors the events from a purely physical point of view of Lok without rational thinking. As already mentioned in the arrow scene, for example, Lok does not understand that it is not a present but the implied reader deduces that one of the new people has shot at him an arrow. The implied reader therefore, unlike Lok and Fa, is not so much surprised when suddenly faced with "intelligent-violent humankind" in the last chapters. Similarly, the scene when the new people eat meat and have an orgy is deeply shocking because, while Lok cannot understand what happens, the implied reader realizes from Lok's limited perspective/intelligence that Liku has been cooked and eaten. Irony is aroused: "There was no smell of Liku unless a sort of generalized smell in his nostrils so faint as to be nothing" (182). In another scene, for instance, Fa supposes that the new people are "frightened of the air where there is nothing" (206) but the implied reader knows that she is wrong because they are frightened of the non-human/animal-like beast, Fa.

The narrative technique also presents us with a paradox. On the one hand, it helps the implied reader to create a great deal of sympathy for the innocent and harmless Neanderthals, but on the other hand, as the novel progresses, the implied reader also feels that the Neanderthals are different from himself/herself. For example, from Lok's perspective "the people [the Neanderthals] were silent. Life was fulfilled, there was no need to look farther for food, to-morrow was secure…" (61) s/he detects a sense of irony and infers from this passage that this group of

people is quite naïve. Therefore, as Ted E. Boyle notes, it is difficult for the attentive reader to sympathise with the Neanderthals "for their plight is not ours and their pictures, are irrelevant." Boyle adds: "Golding's primitives are gentle; we are not. They abhor killing; we do not. They live in the present with little conception of past or future; we are different" (1988: 32). From authorial third-person perspective, "he" becomes "it": "it [Lok] was a strange creature"" (*IN*, 218). In the novel, Fa is the first to recognise the fact that the new people are others: "Here is a picture. Someone is –other. Not one of the people" (71). The implied reader however probably comes to terms with this view of the new people very much earlier, and the narrator-focalizer shares it with him/her now. The implied reader at least discerns the difference between the people and the new people and towards the end of the narrative most probably finds himself identified with the artist Tuami and the surrogate mother Vivani who has adopted the new one.

3.4. Ethics of Otherness and the Possibility of Reconciliation

The originality of *IN* lies in the fact that "Well's ogre" is given an equivocal status of perceiving the events and his perspective is allowed to orient the story for the most part of the narrative. In doing so, the novel undermines H.G. Wells's view of the Neanderthals, turns upside down hitherto accepted concepts of racial superiority and violates the established notion of "otherness" (alterity). As Anna Horatschek states, "ethics [is] the genuine locus for the discussion of alterity" and "any narrative discourse already implies an ethics" (13)[32] She argues that "the dichotomy of alterity and identity" can be deciphered through certain narrative texts and binary logic can be broken (13-14). However, Altes notes that

> there is no such things as 'the' ethics of a text, only various ethical readings. The dangers of using a literary work as a vehicle for promoting pre-set ethical ideas are obvious. However, a careful rhetorical and narratological analysis at least provides a textual basis for an ethically fruitful discussion of interpretations. Ethical reading, if it is to take literature seriously, requires sophisticated skills

> in aesthetic (narratological and rhetorical) analysis" (Altes, 145-146).

IN makes it possible to carry out such an ethical reading, and questions the myth of moral and social evolution, and manipulates the idea of "otherness" (alterity). As Peck and Coyle argue, the term "other" represents how groups of people describe those who appear to be outsiders and threaten them (154). Furthermore, the groups tend to characterise these outsiders even as non-human. Peck and Coyle state that "racism is a practice that operates by categorising ethnic groups as "other", as "outsiders", as threatening, as alien" (154). It is seen that otherness is a state of identity and the "othering" process works upon certain contexts that are based upon difference and differentiation (Horatschek, 12-14). That is, the othering process is also concerned with "discourse that divides reality up into binary opposites" (Peck and Coyle, 154). *IN* attempts to undermine such binary oppositions (i.e., the Neanderthal man/Homo sapiens, primitive/intellectual, monster/human) through shifting perspectives. It is seen that already accepted moral categories (good and evil) are also turned upside down in *IN*.

According to Samuel Hynes the moral of the novel is simple, it is not a very complicated one: the conflict between the Neanderthals and Homo sapiens can be considered in terms of "knowledge of evil and capacity for thought" (Redpath, 85). The Neanderthals stand for good with their moral standards grounded on their belief in the female earth goddess, Oa, and in biblical terms they can be considered as "unfallen" (Redpath, 85). Homo sapiens, however, are presented in a way as killers and hunters at the expense of the loss of innocence. However, *IN* is not a novel that simply offers such formulations about human nature. Philip Redpath argues that surface interpretations are not sufficient to discover the meaning because the novel poses the implied reader some problems and does not "contain a message that is basic and simple" (78) the Neanderthals' killing can be read as being necessary for the sake of survival. The novel's structure and language are difficult and the implied reader should "explore the implications of this structure in relation to the nature of man as revealed in both

texts," and understand that *IN* provides the implied reader with suggestions rather than easy answers. The narrative technique used in *IN* is arranged to hinder clear-cut definitions.

It is therefore possible to view the same thing from different perspectives; and even from within the same perspective, who perceives determines what is perceived. In this context, the image and portraying of other is an attempt to produce ideological constructs.[33] For example, the three different perspectives belonging to Homo sapiens (Wells, the narrator and Tuami) reveal the Neanderthal man differently: Wells conceives him as an ogre with cannibalistic tendencies, the narrator perceives him as a poor, naïve, sympathetic "red creature"; Tuami perceives him as a "fearful red devil." It is difficult and not appropriate to label one side good and the other side evil. Such an over-interpretation may lead to ignoring the complexity created through the novel's structure. As Redpath states, "*IN* undermines a too-simple labelling of the Neanderthalers as good and the new people as evil" (90). Accordingly, whether or not the novel really "objects to [the] rationalistic philosophy of progress and evolutional superiority" (Dickson, 28) is controversial since the implied reader will eventually feel sympathy also for Homo sapiens and understand that rational thinking and progress are inevitable in the face of many threats to survival.

The novel attempts to open up space for a critique of "otherness" ("Wells' ogre") and shows that this ogre can be portrayed differently from another perspective. It is seen that once the perspective is changed, the ogre is no longer a monster (other). With its emancipatory potential, the novel becomes a critical reading as well, and as a moral allegory, challenges dominant power structures. The technique of perspectivisation proves that the category of "other" is definitely relative because the people and the new people characterize each other as threatening outsiders. For Lok, the new people are "other" (*IN*, 69, 71, 76, 77, 85, 86, 87, 93, 95) because they are "incomprehensively strange" (137) and bring about "knowledge of fear" (140) and "extreme peril" (173). It is seen that, they are "frightened of the new people. From Tuami's perspective, however, Lok is a threatening "monster" (224), Lok, Fa and Liku are "devils" (*IN*, 225, 226, 227, 228,

232, 233) and the new One is the "little devil", that is, "other". Again, fear plays an important role in their characterisation of them as other. As they are leaving the "devils" behind, "the [new] people[34] feel a sense of release as if a lifted weapon has been lowered" (232).

So, the possibility of seeing from different perspectives is exemplified by *IN*, and the narrator-focalizer, beyond being restricted to imposing established truths, turns out to be a manipulator. Paul Crawford, states that this novel "explodes the myth of cultured, civilized humankind" (68) and "subverts cultural assumptions" (68). The extermination of the "matriarchal" Neanderthals by "patriarchal" new people, for example, is told from a different perspective, the Neanderthal's, which has violated the implied authority of omniscient narration. The narrating agent is reduced to mere observer in this novel. The novel in this sense cannot be considered a mere attack on common assumptions about the superiority of Homo sapiens over the primitive and evolution.

The scene, where Lok, with the branches bending, is physically turned upside down, is a clue to his awareness of himself and other. Crawford argues that his literal turn brings about an "inverted world" and a "reflected double" (72) since Lok is confronted by his own image in the water and gets confused: "The water rose, bringing a Lok-face with it. There was a tremble of light over the Lok-face" (*IN*, 107-108). In his reflected double ("Lok-face" in the water) he differentiates himself from the people and the new people: "He ceased to think of the old people or the new people. He experienced Lok, upside down over deep water with a twig to save him (107-108).

Crawford argues that *IN* "interrogates human civilization in the wake of World War II atrocities." (Crawford, 76)[35] Accordingly, because of the inclusion of Lok's perspective, the implied reader begins to realize that dominant cultural assumptions of humankind are questionable myths. Crawford stresses the irony presented in the novel and notes:

> Like Lok, our view of events are turned upside down. By gradual recognition of natural phenomena, over the

> shoulder of Lok's limited consciousness, we shift from a fantastic world, where there is hesitation between explanations, where things are half apprehended, barely ordered, to an increasingly clear resolution that we have been viewing this world through the eyes of Neanderthal Man −that the "others" are indeed the original colonists, our own progenitors, and that these New People, like ourselves, are powerful, intelligent, and violent. […] A full account of human kind's history of violence, war, and destruction is made. The novel, then, presents a topsy-turvy account of human nature and registers a symbolic subversion of dominant cultural assumptions of humankind as superior, as morally progressive, beneficent, cultured colonizer (72-73).

But this novel is also an experiment to understand human fear of the other. For instance, Fa supposes the new people are "frightened of the air where there is nothing" (206) but the implied reader infers that she is wrong because Homo sapiens is clearly frightened of the non-human/animal-like beast, Fa. The implied author explores human potential for facing the other and his fears. Homo sapiens's fear is understandable because they do not know anything about the red creatures and think of them as embodying evil spirits. Therefore they hold, for example, exorcist stag rituals to expel the curse of these creatures. Once the fear of the "unknown," the "other" is recognised, the labelling of human motives for such acts as purely evil is impossible. Upon considering this idea of reconciliation, the strategy of playing with perspectives, turns into a device for unity instead of dissociation. *IN,* therefore, is not "an ironic revelation of man's fallen state" although it is possible to find out some evidences to read the novel as an allegory of the fall, and to see Homo sapiens as morally fallen beings. Of course it can be thought of as presenting a vision of a "previous paradise" on earth in the wake of big catastrophes in the annals of mankind. The attentive reader, however, is always made to interpret the novel beyond mere illustration of human potential for evil and capacity to destroy. Even Lok's increasing awareness and getting drunk before having violent sex with Fa, as human beings do, can be read as a sign of this reconciliation. Thus, human beings can never be as innocent as the Neanderthals are; but a Neanderthal man has some potential for imitating

Human beings. The last, and may be the most striking, gesture for reconciliation is illustrated in the scenes quoted above, in which a homo sapiens woman, Vivany, who has lost her baby recently, is seen to be playing with the new One, the Neanderthal baby. Although Vivani's confused feelings of fear and anxiety are stressed, Vivani's breastfeeding of the "little devil" can be read as a real metaphor for the possibility of reconciliation.

Finally, *IN* is a novel of shifting perspectives and calls into question the widely accepted notion of science and anthropology and the controversial issue of "otherness." The inclusion of an epigraph is crucial to this novel, where ethical, historical and political implications are being made. In the epigraph, the other is represented by the "monstrous ogre" (the Neanderthal man), portrayed in Wells' *Outline of History*. The originality of the novel lies in the fact that the "ogre" is given an equivocal status of perceiving the events from his own perspective. In fact, the implied reader is allowed to perceive the Neanderthal man from three different perspectives: Lok's (Wells' so-called "ogre"), Tuami's (the Homo Sapiens) and that of the narrator-focalizer, which seems so close to that of the implied author. Interestingly, from Lok's perspective, the human being is perceived as "other." So, the dissertation has argued, categories are intentionally complicated and dichotomies are turned upside down. When focalized from within, "Wells' monstrous other" turns out to be a sensitive and naive creature, giving some sense of "sameness" that the implied reader can sympathise with. So, the narrative technique, through shifting focalizations, helps the reader perceive the other and human being from their own perspective and provides the attentive reader with new insights into ways of reconciliation with the other and into the human potential for fear as much as evil. Thus, the established view of the human being is also undermined, and easy but pure dichotomies (good/evil, self/other, developed/primitive) are turned upside down and questioned.

The technique of shifting perspectives brings about some variations in language and Neanderthal naivety is revealed through their simple language and

verbal expressions. It is seen that, while the narrator's language is refined and poetic, the Neanderthal language is relatively primitive and highly picturesque. The implied reader, therefore, should deal with both the world/perception of the narrator and that of the Neanderthals. Through changing levels of focalizations, the narrative does not reveal a certain and fixed image of the main character (Lok) but creates various pictures of the same figure (Lok and his world as objects of focalization). In chapter 11, it is seen that the perspective shifts from Lok's mind to that of the narrator, from which the implied reader for the first time sees "the primitive ogre" from without. When focalized from without, he is seen, this time, not necessarily as a monster but at least as a primitive alien. The personal pronoun changes, "he" (Lok) becomes "it" (Lok-the other) and in chapter 12, from the new people's perspective, the Neanderthal man is conceived as a "devil" reminding the implied reader of Wells' monsterous ogre.

It is seen that ethical and historical facts are unreliable and remain questionable. It is shown that the technique, although it praises plurality in perspective, resists simplified polarity. The Neanderthal man is no longer a monster; and human beings, despite having a great role in the decline of the Neanderthals, are portrayed also with a potential for goodness. So, the conflict between Neanderthal man and Homo sapiens is no more a clear-cut conflict as illustrated in the reconciliation scene where a Neanderthal baby is being breast-fed by a Homo sapiens woman. Shifts in perspective thus help the implied reader to understand human fear and to gain insight into the ways of reconciliation. The novel, therefore, is also a narrative of reconciliation, which the artist Tuami's reflections at the end of the novel and the physical and psychological relationship between the new One and Vivani represent. To conclude, the strategy of playing with perspectives turns into a device for unity instead of dissociation.

CHAPTER IV

Postmortem Story Of Negation: *Pincher Martin* (1956)

This chapter attempts to show how the implied author plays with temporality in order to reflect the post-mortem individual (un)consciousness[36] of the protagonist. First, it analyses the narrative by using Genette's terminology and tries to explicate its complex narrative levels and levels of focalizations. Second, it combines these findings with the question of atemporality, which is closely related to the "centre" representing the consciousness of the protagonist. Third, it tries to find how various narrative levels and focalizations help to reveal Martin's past and present, his intellectual and physical condition, and his struggle against nonexistence. Lastly, it shows the crucial function of the coda as the highest level of narration, and explores how this authorial gimmick invites the implied reader to reread/review the story/the human condition against the idea of death.

PM is set during World War II and attempts to portray a character called Christopher Hadley Martin, who has no belief in anything but his own existence and identity. He is revealed as having been washed up on a bare rock in mid-Atlantic after his ship is torpedoed. It seems that the narrator-focalizer invites the implied reader to perceive a situation in which the character struggles against both physical and psychological constraints. However, the castaway's struggle is in fact against the idea of death rather than against the strict and harsh conditions of nature. As the novel progresses, the implied reader understands that Martin is an actor by profession and, this time, he, having been reduced to mere consciousness, plays his most striking part against death. To achieve this, he invents his own reality as if he were on a rock and persists in keeping up his intellectual existence. Golding states that "the greed for life which had been the mainspring of his nature, forced him to refuse the selfless act of dying. He continued to exist in a

world composed of his own murderous nature. His drowned body lies rolling in the Atlantic but the ravenous ego invents a rock for him to endure on" (Friedman, ed., 52). He can therefore be thought of as "not fighting for bodily survival but for his continuing identity" (Dickson, 43). That is, he attempts to create his own imaginary world, which shows that he attempts to play God, and insistently defies death and God. As he is an unbeliever, the novel illustrates his purgatory through natural means, the rock and other environmental stuff. Golding stated that "he did not believe in purgatory and therefore when he died it was not presented to him in overtly theological terms" (Friedman, ed., 52). Gindin describes it as a "timeless human purgatory" (43). In this invented and ostensibly material purgatory, the character is perceived to face his past misdeeds. Until the last chapter, the implied reader observes him and inhabits his mind and therefore learns a lot about his past memories as well as his present feelings and thoughts. However, with the inclusion of a coda in the last chapter, the implied reader learns that the rock is an invention of Martin's persisting mind because he died within a few minutes of a torpedo attack.

Through interior monologues and past reminiscences which are reflected on his mind as scenes, the implied reader comes across "Pincher" Martin: His reminiscences show that he seduced his friend's (Pete) wife, had an affair with Alfred's girlfriend Sybil and attempted to seduce the prudish virgin Mary, Nathaniel's girlfriend. Furthermore, in a motorcycle race, he crippled his friend Peter. Also, he attempted to murder his best friend Nathaniel. All these seductions and betrayals reveal that Martin "humiliated" (Friedman, 53) the people around him in different ways. His initial name (Christopher) and his nickname (Pincher) are rather ironic because his actions deny the Christian idea of goodness and his nickname directly refers to his outstanding characteristic (that of taking or stealing). Dickson states that *PM* is a modern allegory and Baker appreciates Martin[37] as a "traditional thinker" (Foreword, 16). Frank Kermode, who considers the "mythical" aspects of *PM,* regards it as "a horrible book" (62) because "man is [portrayed as] shrunk so mercilessly into his minimal disgusting humanity" (62), and Kinkead-Weekes and Gregor (1967) and Boyd's (1990) discussions again

revolve around the same theme. Similarly, it is also possible to see *PM* as a reproduction of *Robinson Crusoe* in a modern context (with a conventional shipwreck element). Elements such as a survivor of a torpedoed British destroyer, and isolation on a remote place, having lost almost all physical ties with life and society create a modern Prometheus. In this novel, too, the protagonist is portrayed as refusing utterly to accept defeat against the physical constraints of nature, and against the psychological challenges of the past.

The originality of the novel, however, also lies in its spatial and temporal arrangements: The implied author reduces the character to mere consciousness utterly isolated and stripped of all ties with the outside world, and moreover, s/he locates this consciousness out of time. The novel also produces a narrative which questions its own reliability and undermines its own narration through a coda. So, technically, the narrative can be analyzed in terms of the perspectivization of the protagonist's mind and the inclusion of the coda. Redpath, therefore, argues that the analysis of the novel can be based upon the narrator-focalizer's frequent reference to a "centre" that is related to the cognitive processes of the mind of the character; analysis can also be based on the "coda" that is related to the structural pattern of the narrative. This dissertation, therefore, takes into consideration these aspects but it also attempts to use more solid tools for investigation and highlights the role of the narrative elements of voice, mood and temporal organizations.

As an unreliable account of a narrator-focalizer, *PM* presents the implied reader with a complicated narrative technique by which the narration reaches beyond the limitations of the omniscient narration with a fixed point of view. It is seen that playing with perspective and temporal arrangements play an important role in the investigation/illustration of a character's inexplicable, and somewhat absurd, universe and God-resisting soul. Samuel Hynes notes that it is "the most impressive of Golding's novels." He adds: "It is also the most difficult, because its form is an involved representation of time and consciousness" (Hynes: 1987 [1976], 125). When the novel was first published in the United States, the original title of the novel was *The Two Deaths of Christopher*, and Lawrence

Friedman, in his "A Double Dying: *PM*" (1993), refers to this point, which is suggestive because the novel primarily focuses on the resistance to death within the realm of atemporality. But, in each case, it will be seen (and this dissertation argues) that these interpretations can be understood better with the recognition of narrative strategies such as narrative levels, focalizations, free indirect (transposed) speeches or interior monologues, which make it possible to break into the boundaries of the act of narration and to penetrate the intellectual and imaginary world of the character.

In *PM*, the physical remoteness of Martin, who conceives of himself as being smashed on a remote rock in the Atlantic, creates a psychological closeness with the character and makes it possible to focus on the very unconscious of the character, which covers thoughts, feelings, the past, the present, the imagery and dreams. The fact that most of the narrative is focused on his imaginary world, expands the temporal limits of the story. It is possible to recognise parallels between Martin's past (mis)deeds and the sea storm as well as between the unreliable existence of the protagonist and the extradiegetic narrator's final surprise. Martin's unpleasant and selfish past challenges his present but the narrator seems to be tricking both the character and the implied reader into believing something unreal; his surprising coda threatens, indeed destroys, Martin's very existence, and all that Martin has thought and felt turns out to be mere speculation of his struggling mind.

Martin as a character on an isolated rock and Martin as a focalizer are made to struggle painfully to exist and manifest his identity. In the story, rescue would not be possible for Martin (character), but thanks to the act of focalization, the centre (focalizer) tries to exist through the decelerated narration about the struggling soul. This is remarkable in this context because it provides us with entrance into the spatial realm of timelessness/atemporality, with a point of reference in a world of uncertainties that stands for the unreliable (un)consciousness of the focal character. Thus, the remote setting, the confined world both in terms of time and space, chronological shifts, a restricted shifting

perspective and an unusual character (neither dead nor alive and almost reduced to mere (un)consciousness) become significant points on which the narrative structure is based.

Thus, *PM* invites the implied reader to question reality as well as the way it is presented because it is a novel that violates its own clarity and requires a double reading. The novel presents a world which is mostly perceived through the mind of the character and turns out to be an exploration of atemporality. Therefore, *PM* not only tells the story of a character, but also tells the story of how the technique of focalization and different levels of narration help develop this character and how a narrative can violate its own narration, as will be seen in the case of the coda.

4.1. Levels of Narration and Focalizations

PM presents the implied reader with a relatively difficult structure. The difficulty lies in its complicated narrative levels and focalizations by which the novel reinforces its status as the discovery of the human condition. The narrative levels help construct the character at the present and in the past, and the web of focalizations serve to reveal the thoughts and perceptions of that character. Bal suggests that focalizations expand the dominant authorial vision and creates a sense of plurality. Yet, as Bal notes in the introduction to her *On Story-telling*, "the narrative mode is deceptive precisely because this plurality is ordered" (2).[38] Through narrative levels and focalizations the implied reader gains insight into the character but in *PM*, the narrative itself finally shows that this plurality is organized and controlled by the extradiegetic narrator and the implied author.

In *PM*, the story is told and mediated by a third person narrator, who remains outside the story and does not take place as a character in the story. So, the narrator is an extradiegetic-heterodiegetic narrator in Genettean terms. As the narrator is also an external focalizer (narrator-focalizer), the implied reader can perceive the events from different perspectives. The extradiegetic narrator's

framing narrative includes numerous sub-narratives. These narrative parts perceived through the mind of the character are mere thoughts and imaginary pictures which constitute partial/fragmented narratives that contribute to the plurality of the novel. This marks a multilayered structure in terms of narrative levels and perspectives. It is seen that thoughts, scenes, images and recollections are revealed through the consciousness of the character and make up these metadiegetic narratives in the second and third degree. This suggests a change in the tone of the voice adopted by the narrator or sometimes a shift in perspective achieved by the act of focalizations. However, it is difficult to follow up these changes without recognizing these narrative levels because the story has only one central character (Martin), who is severely injured at the beginning and then, as a mere consciousness, becomes completely devoid of physical action.

In *PM*, there is only one narrator who is extradiegetic-heterodiegetic. One of the striking examples of this is when Martin asks himself why he cannot sleep. In this scene the extradiegetic narrator describes how Martin is suffering in a desperate situation. The use of the first person seems to refer to Martin as an intradiegetic narrator. For example: "Why did I take my sea boots off?" (12) or "I wish I'd kept my seaboots." (83). According to the present analysis, these words are part of the extradiegetic narration, as indicated by the fact that they are given in quotation marks, and mostly reported with some transition verbs such as: "He thought," (12) or "'he spoke" (84). The passage shows that the character's words are embedded in the extradiegetic narrator's discourse. As seen in the following lines, his speech is introduced by a transitional remark: "he began to think" (91), and only the initial interrogative statement of his inner speech is given in quotation marks:

> He began to think desperately about sleep.
> […]
> "Then why can't I sleep?"
> Sleep is where we touch what is better left unexamined. There the whole life is bundled up, dwindled. There the carefully hoarded and enjoyed personality, our only treasure and at the same time our only defence must die into the ultimate truth of things, the black lightening that

> splits and destroys all, the positive, unquestionable nothingness.
> And I lie here, a creature […]
> O God! Why can't I sleep? (91)

The shift between the narrative levels entails close attention because it may be almost unrecognizable in some cases. Some grammatical discourse markers such as the first person pronoun 'I' and the third person 'he', or a change in the tense used in the narrating act may help to differentiate between these narrative levels. The transition from 'I' to 'he' may indicate a transition from one level to another but it requires close attention to differentiate between the voice of the narrator or the protagonist in such cases of indirect reporting of speech or thought. Grammatical markers may deceive us. The above free indirect reporting, for example, belongs to the narrator but the perception does not. Thus, discourse produces different levels in *PM* as well as voices/perspectives, and there are shifts between the narrative and focalization levels of the story being told.

In *PM*, the protagonist appears to be reduced to a consciousness, which is often referred to as the "centre". The framing narrative is therefore virtually eventless and mostly devoted to the verbal games of a thinking/imagining mind. Martin, with an intense flow of thoughts about his present situation, is portrayed as dashed into the crevices on a rock and viewed as suffering from physical pain:

> The man was inside two crevices. There was first the rock, closed and not warm but at least not cold with the coldness of sea or air. The rock was negative. It confined his body so that here and there the shudders were beaten; not soothed but forced inward. He felt pain throughout his body but distant pain that was sometimes to be mistaken for fire. […]He knew as an axiom of existence that he must be content with the smallest of all small mercies as he floated there. […] If he could hit some particular mode of inactive being, some some subtlety of interior balance, he might be allowed by the nature of the second crevice to float, still and painless in the centre of the globe.

But then the narrative level shifts to a lower one, in Genettean terms, that refers to Martin's past:

> Then slowly he would sink back into the centre of the globe, shrink and float in the middle of a dark world. This became a rhythm that had obtained from all ages and would endure so. This rhythm was qualified but not altered in essentials by pictures that happened to him and sometimes to someone else. They were brightly lit in comparison with the fires. […]
>
> There was an order in neon lighting. There was a woman, not like the white detailed bodies but with a face. There was the gloom and hardness of a night-time ship, the lift of the deck, the slow cant and bumble. He was walking forward across the bridge to the binnacle and its dim light (50).

Moreover, the narrator-focalizer continues to give the accounts of Martin, but as the novel progresses "the man" turns into a "creature" as will be seen in the following passage where Martin still thinks that he is seriously ill and resists the idea of death and suffers. His physical suffering is also interrupted by changes in the narrative level. Persistent images and reminiscences from the past will gradually begin to hurt him:

> There was still the silent indisputable, creature that sat at the centre of things, but it seemed to have lost the knack of distinguishing between pictures and reality. Occasionally the gate in the lower part of the globe would open against the soft lifebelt and words come out but each statement was so separated by the glossy and illuminated scenes the creature that took part in that it did not know which was relevant to which.
>
> "I said that I should be sick."
>
> "Drink. Food. Sanity. Rescue."
>
> "I shall call them the−"
>
> But the glossy images persisted, changed, not as one cloud shape into another but with sudden and complete differences of time and place.
>
> "Sit down, Martin."
>
> "Sir."
>
> "We're considering whether we should recommend you for a commission. Cigarette?"
>
> (93)

The implied reader becomes a spectator as well, in this long dialogue between the Navy officer and Martin, a scene given in a second degree narrative related with Martin's past. Before the upper narrative level is reinstated and Martin turns back to his rock, the implied reader is involved in his stream of consciousness:

> A Chinese box.
>
> A sword is a phallus. What a huge mountain-shaking joke. A phallus is a sword. Down, dog, down. Down on all fours where you belong.
>
> Then he was looking at a half-face and crying out. […] a glossy picture swept the blue sky […] The circle was filled with blue sea where gulls were wheeling and settling and loving to eat and fight. (95-96)

That Martin refers to a Chinese box is interesting since the Chinese box signifies his past (an object from his past) and it is at the same time a striking metaphor for the embedded narrative structure presented in *PM*. The Chinese box is "evasive," which is blurred and opaque but unforgettable. He adds, "however evasive, it [is] important and intrusive" (95). This state of intrusiveness is common in the novel, where such pictures from the past, a series of scenes from the past or a set of images are reflected through the unconscious.

It is seen that the extradiegetic narrator in *PM* mediates the narration in various levels, but as a narrator-focalizer s/he also creates a sense of liberation through focalizing the character thinking or by yielding the narration to the character's consciousness. *PM* often manipulates the narrative strategy of seeing, which sometimes undermines the expectations of the implied reader. Kinkead-Weekes therefore states that Golding, unlike the romantics and the modernists, "uses the visionary against the visual and the visual against the visionary." He questions "what and how Golding means by "seeing"? (65) The use of recurrent imagery underscores the significance of the eye and seeing (as well as writing and telling a story). Perceiving through the mind of the character enriches the message and helps reflect the experience of the character. So, the implied reader gains insight into the events, characters or objects, which may have epistemological and metaphysical implications. Kinkead-Weekes considers *PM* as a reinforcement of a

paradox and underlines the fact that "sight is nothing without insight" (65). So, in *PM* the physical eye turns out to be a means of penetration and insight into the objects of focalization. Imagery in *PM* has therefore nothing to do with the surface but is the reflector of the very depth of the (un)consciousness and its manifestations combined with ongoing intellectual speculations. It is seen that "thoughts," "pictures" or "scenes" are simultaneously presented as the words of a sleep-talker:

> (1) His head nodded on his knees.
>
> (2) "All the blue watch. Blue watch to muster."
>
> (3) The pictures were interrupted by the solid shape of a snore. (4) The shiverings were less dramatic but they took power from his arms so that presently they fell away from his knees and his hands lay on the pebbles (*PM,* 30).

Here, in (1) there is a physical observation of the crippled character on the rock and it is seen that his body is twisted and has lost its shape (head on the knees). After this physical description of the character, in (2) thoughts and memories are revealed and the character is focalized from within. His perception of blue and his wish to gather together the pieces of his mind imply his mental activity as well. In (3) the implied reader goes on perceiving Martin's thoughts and disappointments while his attempt at mustering them interrupted by his physical condition. This time, the character turns into a focalizing eye, focalizing his own body and describing the act of snoring as having a solid shape. In (4), from the character's perspective the implied reader learns how he feels. Here the voice reporting the interruption and describing his snoring is that of the extradiegetic narrator who controls the act of narration. Needless to say, this necessity is predetermined by the implied author because the selection of the narrated parts completely depends on him/her. This extradiegetic narration in the third person carries on throughout the narrative but the authorial perspective is enriched with the alternative perspective of the character.

Narrative level is a category related with narrator(s) which is different from the level of focalizations. A change of level in the focalizing often "goes

hand in hand with a change in narrative level," but, as Bal states, not always (93). It is seen in *PM* that the extradiegetic narrator is also an external focalizer (narrator-focalizer) focalizing the character thinking, dreaming or hallucinating and in some scenes, although the narrative level does not alter, the focalization level may change. The extradiegetic narrator, presenting the character's deductions, goes on telling the story of the character at the same narrative level but there is a change in the way the scene is perceived. In such cases, the extradiegetic narrator is also an external focalizer, that is, a narrator-focalizer, where the object of focalization is the character, and the character is focalized from without or within. Therefore the implied reader can see the events from different perspectives. For example, in the following scene, Martin is thinking and hallucinating, and the narrative level (voice) does not change, but an obvious shift in perspective is remarkable:

> He looked firmly at sea. All at once he found that he was seeing through a window again. He was inside himself at the top end. The window was bounded above […] divided into three lights by two outlines or shadows of noses. But the noses were transparent. The right-hand light was fogged […] The window was surrounded by inscrutable darkness which extended throughout his body. (82)

Some important signs of focalization here are "seeing through a window," "transparent" and "darkness." All signal the change in perspective from the narrator to the character, from whose point of view, just like a window, there appear some lights, transparent images, and also an unfathomable darkness swallowing up his body. Thus, as stated earlier in the theory chapter, such focalizations help regulate the information given, which particularly deserves more attention in the case of imperceptible objects in Mieke Bal's terms (see Chp. 2). This indirect way of conveying idea and information contributes to the narration and therefore to the story. The mimetic or realistic effect (highly illusionary) aroused in the implied reader is particularly due to such focalizations, through which the implied reader can escape one-dimensional confinement to some extent. Just like the metaphor of the Chinese box, Martin is made (by the

implied author) to use another metaphor, the window, which can perfectly stand for "windows of focalizations"[39] and this use cannot be accidental. The focalizations, on the other hand, highlight the implied author at work and his great power to penetrate into his subjects and objects (the constructed reality and character acquire deepness and detail).

Moreover, Martin's interior monologues, thoughts, and reminiscences which are given without quotation marks in the text, are internal focalizations bringing about a sense of intradiegetic reflection and sometimes can be confused with the following third person exterior narration:

> (1)
>
> He began to think slowly. I have tumbled in a trench. My head is jammed against the farther side and my neck is twisted. My legs must be up in the air over the other wall. My thighs […] My right toes […] I feel […] My fingers might be made of wood. […] That whiter white under the water along there is my hand, hidden.
>
> (2)
>
> There was a descending scream in the air, a squawk and the beating of wings. A Gull was breaking widely over the wall at the end of the trench, legs and claws held out (41).

These narrative parts like Chinese boxes one inside another are mediated by the narrator-focalizer. They include free indirect speech, interior monologue and reported speech, all of which form parts of story-telling. These metadiegetic parts mostly focus on the character's thoughts and feelings. They play a significant role in the narrative of *PM*.

Throughout the novel, the implied reader is burdened with following the shifts in focalizations. The narrator-focalizer, for example, is seen at work in the following passage:

> (1) The slow movement of his mind settled on a thought. (2) There was a small fire in his body that was almost extinguished but incredibly was still smouldering despite the Atlantic. (3) He folded his body consciously round that

> fire and nursed it. (4) There was not more than a spark. The formal words and the pictures evolved themselves.
> (5) A seabird cried over him with a long sound descending down wind. (6) He removed his attention from the spark of fire and opened his eyes again. (7) This time he had got back so much of his personality that he could look out and grasp the whole of what he saw at once. (8) There were the dark walls of rock on either side that framed the brighter light.
> […]
> (9) He looked closely at a button. (10) His mouth shut then opened. (11) Sounds came out. (12) He readjusted them and they were uncertain words.
>
> (13) "I know you. Nathaniel sewed you on. I asked him to. Said it was an excuse to get him away from the mess-deck for a bit of peace."
>
> (14) His eyes closed again… (*PM*, 29)

In (1), (2), (3) and (4) Martin's mind is focalized from within by the narrator-focalizer. In (5) focalization shifts outward. Here, the implied reader is made to believe that Martin has taken shelter on the rock and seabirds are flying in the sky. Martin cannot see them (he did not open his eyes) but "hears" their sound. The narrator-focalizer presents the implied reader with both sight and sound (ocular and auricular perception). Martin's perception of sound is revealed in a specific way: "descending down wind." The character hears the sound gradually. In (6) "the spark of fire" is again a direct reference to Martin's pain. The focalization shifts in the second half of the statement and Martin is viewed as opening his eyes. In (7), (8) Martin's thoughts are revealed. He tries to integrate his personality (not his body) and perception in his mind. In (9), (10) and (11) the narrator-focalizer focalizes the character from without.[40] In (11) there is an indication of internal-focalization from without because, the character simultaneously perceives his own words (hears the sounds). Here the implied author suggests that the character is alienated from his own voice ("sound" is used instead of "voice"). Martin becomes a character-focalizer perceiving (focalizing) his own organs (sounds came out of his mouth). In (13) the narrator-focalizer conveys his words. The (14) indicates the recuperation of external-focalization from without. It is seen that the implied reader again is invited to carry out an

attentive reading and to follow up the clues to Martin's past. In (13) the implied reader hears about Nathaniel, which refers to Martin's personal history, but this does not make any sense at this point. So, *PM* presents a narrative of present physical struggle interwoven with past events, spiritual agony, and intellectual persistence. After each scene from his past, the implied reader views the protagonist trapped in his present strenuous efforts for survival.

Some of the narratives in *PM* reveal the character as an internal focalizer focalizing objects from within or without. Focalizations can this time hint at the focalizer's psychological condition[41] and mindset, and in this way they generally serve to build up characterization:

> He considered the mussels with positive distaste and switched his mind instead to the bags of jelly on the seaweed. He had a vague feeling that his stomach was talking to him. It disliked mussels. As for anemones –the bare thought made the bag contract and sent a foul taste to his mouth (116).

In this passage Martin ("he") is focalized on the first level from without by the external focalizer/narrator. The character is located at the first narrative level as the focalized from within. The word "considered" indicates a change in the level of focalization, the focalizer now is the character himself, and the character as internal focalizer starts to function at the second level of focalization, the focalized from without, the objects of focalization are his own body and the stuff around, the mussels like bags of jelly, his stomach seemingly talking to him. Here the character located at the first level is a perceptible object of focalization with respect to the external focalizer/narrator, but the objects of focalization by the character-focalizer are controversial in terms of perceptibility. If they are true, this means that the character is struggling and suffering with a distaste of the weed and mussels. He himself personifies his stomach and attempts to talk to it to express the terrible feeling he has at that helpless time; or, all that are focalized may be imperceptible and this shows that it is a hallucination and the character has gone mad. Thus the narrator-focalizer at the first level yields the floor to the character focalizer, also making possible a change in the mood of the narrative.

In these parts the embedded narration or narrating in a lower level provides new insights into the character and allows the implied reader to hear his inner thoughts, to see the pictures or to witness the scenes referring to the past. For example, in one of the scenes, "the needle" (42), standing for both physical and unacknowledged spiritual/intellectual pain in Martin's world, forms a thematic relationship between the events that are being re-experienced by the protagonist: "This was the most important of all the pains because it thrust a needle now into the dark skull where he lived. The pain could not be avoided. His body revolved round it" (42) Martin is presented as caught up in a darkness, physical and spiritual, and his state of sheer isolation gains meaning solely by the reminiscences, trailers or scenes that make the darkness visible. In the following parts of the narrative, Martin's unknown past is revealed through such metadiegetic narratives as can be seen in the scenes where he remembers dialogues between himself and others, Nathaniel for example (70). The more the implied reader learns about Martin's "dark world" (49) the better s/he can understand what is meant by the "jabbing needle" (53) that Martin recurrently refers to.

The narrator-focalizer and the character-focalizer in *PM* are also other spectators, through the eyes of which the implied reader views the events:

> A tongue of summer lightning licked right inside the inner crevice so that he saw shapes there. Some were angled and massive as the corners of the corridors and between them was the light falling impenetrable distances. One shape was a woman who unfroze for that instant and lived. […] He knew without thinking who she was […] he knew why she was breathing so quickly, lifting the silk blouse with apples, the forbidden fruit… (147)

In this passage the word "saw" is the initial sign foreshadowing a shift in the level of focalization. Who "sees shapes" is the character-focalizer being focalized by the narrator-focalizer. Then from Martin's perspective these "angled" and "massive" shapes are presented. Here the invisible extradiegetic spectator views them together with the focalizer. The narrative level and the level of focalization

have been changed by this view then because the shape of the woman refers to a past scene (event) embedded in the general story and here the narrator, narratee (a kind of spectator) are heterodiegetic while the focalizer (Martin) and the focalized (the woman) are homodiegetic. The implied reader perceives the woman from Martin's perspective, which alludes to the biblical metaphor of the "apple" (plural in this case standing for breasts and suggesting sexuality and sin and therefore pain) and provokes further discussion about the ideology hidden in the text. By "the forbidden fruit," what does/can the text mean other than the traditional interpretations of the metaphor? The interpretation relies on who utters the word. The utterer seems uncertain despite the grammatical structure, particularly because of the free indirect discourse, so the utterer can be the implied author, the narrator, Martin of the past, or Martin on the rock.

4.2. Playing with Temporality

The main strategy lying behind the narrative structure of *PM* is playing with time and space, both of which are reduced to mere inventions and delusions of the 'centre'. It can be argued that "the novel is concerned with the problematic search for [this] centre" (Redpath, 144). The centre is the (un)consciousness of Martin, which, from the very beginning, asserts itself as the proof of its own existence and tries "to affirm [his] determination to survive" (*PM*, 77) both physically and mentally. But the rock on which he thinks he is marooned and the time in which he thinks he lives are make-believe and not real. This exemplifies Golding's technique of "phenomenological reduction" or "bracketing" in Whitehead's terms (1988: 41). It can be agued that the bracketing makes it possible to play with atemporality, through which the implied reader gains access to the realm of mere consciousness and the realm of the past in which the implied author questions the reality of the "vulgar conception of time" (42). This is reflected through the act of focalizations and therefore *PM* provides the implied reader with three aspects of time: atemporal, spatial and temporal. The discourse level as an atemporal medium for the story is important. But more importantly,

and also as a distinguishing feature of the novel, the narrative parts dealing with Martin's experience after his controversial death are significant. These moments are also subject to the exploration of atemporality revealed through the character's mind by constant focalizations. The first and last chapter constitute the narrative parts in which the temporal dimensions appear. In this case, the tricky ending of the novel marked by dialogue between Mr. Campbell and Captain Davidson is a manifestation of the law of Nature, that is, turning back from Martin's atemporal fictitious dreamworld to the implied author's fictitious reality.

On the story level, the novel explores the atemporal realm revealed through focalizations, which present only fragmented data, produced by an unreliable narrator-focalizer. For example, at the beginning of the novel, the implied reader finds the character in the middle of the ocean. The place is not actually a reference to any recognizable "real" place:

> He thought suddenly of the boat sinking through water towards a bottom that was still perhaps a mile remote from them. With that, the whole wet immensity seemed to squeeze his body as though he were sunk to a great depth. His chattering teeth came together and the flesh of his face twisted. He arched in the water, drawing his feet up away from the depth, the slopping, glutinous welter." (13)

Here, the word "chattering" addresses both the ear and the eye, depicting the character audio-visually. Despite its restricted space, penetration into the realm of the invisible or (un)consciousness is achieved through a number of windows of focalizations at different levels. There is no specification of place and time but the most significant characteristic of *PM* is its embracing and fusing of the past, the present and the future in a single moment or in a time frame. Martin's story begins just after he falls into the ocean and starts drifting over the waves, which is told at the first pages in the novel. Then comes the point when Martin dies, but he is seen rejecting death and the afterlife. He resists passing away because there is no "away" for Martin, therefore he tries to go on and keep a hold on his existence; and, from that point on, the novel deals with his hopeless struggle against death. So this "post-mortem drama" is a novel of atemporality in which, as İçöz states,

"the past, the present and the future are fused in one single image" (64), in which time melts away.

The implied reader learns just before the end of the framing narrative that Christopher Hadley Martin or "Pincher" must have died soon after the torpedo incident. It is implied in Mr. Davison's remarks that Martin has not suffered long: "He didn't even have time to kick off his sea boots" (208). It is seen in these ending words, which constitutes the most striking remark of the coda, that the narrative is almost completely removed from the temporal universe to an atemporal realm of "the centre" which is used to define the struggling (un)consciousness of Martin, signalling the reduced condition of man in his extremely isolated world. Most of the novel is shown at the end to have been Martin's own mental games, dreams or hallucinations, which are revealed through focalizations. Thus, although the implied reader thinks that the real time experienced through the act of reading is shorter than the time experienced by Martin, this is reversed with Davidson's last words, which indicates that the real time of reading is actually much longer than the illusory time actually depicted in the story.[42] The question of duration in terms of the time of the narrating, therefore, displays a different characteristic in *PM*. Almost all of the narrative turns out to have been built up by the mind of the character in an atemporal state. So, in *PM* it is difficult to attribute a time concept to the events revealed through focalizations and almost impossible to locate them in space and time.[43] As a result, *PM*, paradoxically, violates its temporal and spatial dimensions. Its temporality is overlooked and intentionally obscured, and its spatial dimension appears to be the unreliable consciousness of a "dead" character.

PM deliberately resists a clear-cut analysis of time and with its narrative structure it tries to prevent the implied reader from locating the character only within spatial/temporal frames. The sense of atemporality suggested in *PM* refers to another level of understanding on which the story (except for the coda) cuts its ties with temporality and mere spatiality. At the outset, the narrator-focalizer appears to stretch the time of the narrating act to its limits and translate the

atemporal experience of the character into another "atemporal" realm of its narrative discourse because the narrative text/discourse of *PM* necessarily creates an atemporal medium for the story. This is the paradox of narratives because they "possess at the same time a temporal situation and an atemporal essence (Genette, 223). For example, in *PM* the implied reader is frequently presented with scenes from the past, the spatial realm of the mind, presented through the mind of a man stranded upon a rock in the sea. Martin thinks:

> Killed and eaten. And of course eating with the mouth was only the gross expression of what was a universal process. You could eat with your cock or with your fists, or with your voice. You could eat with hobnailed boots or buying and selling or marrying and begetting or cuckolding–
> Cuckolding reminded him.
>
> He [Martin] turned from the mirror, bound his dressing gown, with the cord and opened the bathroom door. And there, coming towards him, as if the rather antiquated expression had conjured him up was Alfred. But it was a different Alfred, pale, sweating, trembling, coming at a run toward […]
> "Hullo, Alfred!"
> "You bloody swine!"
> […]
> The door opening; Sybil, giving a tiny shriek and pulling the sheet up to her mouth as if this were a bedroom-farce … (89)

Here it is seen that through the spatial realm of the consciousness (thoughts) the mind brings about the past (reminiscences) which suggests a temporal situation and atemporal essence in Genette's terms. On the text level it is atemporal, on the story level it is spatial because it flows through the mind as a reminiscence having lost solid ties with temporality and reliability. However, as a narrative fragment illustrating a past event it is indicative of a temporal dimension in which Martin, Alfred and Sybil are located. Thus it is seen that atemporality and temporality converged.

However, the specific exploration of temporality is seen in Martin's desperate striving for a solid space in which he can posit himself and find a

temporal reference. After the moment of death, which throughout the narrative Martin does not accept, he "must invent his whole world by a kind of deliberate dreaming which must always obey every law of being awake so that he never finds out it is a dream" (Kinkead-Weekes&Gregor, 134). Martin's "deliberate dreaming" is in fact a rejection of death after the moment of death. But Martin needs this "game" in order to remain awake (not alive) and needs space and time. The centre states that "of course a human brain must turn in time and the universe be muddled" (180). This is implied in his endless struggle to set up a "shelter" and an imaginary world for himself. With this solid reference, the implied reader acquires a sense of time in the narrative because space is the necessary condition for time.

> There was at the centre of all the pictures and pains and voices a fact like a bar of steel, a thing that− which was so nakedly the centre of everything that it could not even examine itself. In the darkness of the skull, it existed, a darker dark, self-existent and indestructible.
> "Shelter. Must have shelter."
> The centre began to work (45)

For the attentive reader, what is happening in the story is a "wry game going on" (Kinkead-Weekes and Gregor, 134) because Martin's continuous creative work and manipulative reasoning about his condition on his imaginary rock suggest a parody of the divine week of creation (135). Like God, Martin attempts to imitate this creation to achieve the Law of existence. On the first day, Martin creates (imagines) the sea and the sky around himself and then he creates day and night. He thinks that "the dream is not to be revealed as dream" (135). Therefore he continues to specify the places:

> "And anyway I must not sleep in the daytime. Save that for the miserable nights."
> […]
> "I call this place the look-out. That is the Dwarf. The rock out there under the sun where I came swimming is safety rock. The place where I get mussels and stuff is Food cliff. Where I eat them is –The Red Lion. On the south side where the strap –weed is, I call Prospect Cliff.

Frank Kermode states that the centre is "horribly aware of self-deceit" (66) but needs to go on with this game of creating, naming, speculating. The moment when Martin looks down into the sea from his rock and discerns a red lobster, he cannot understand that it is just a trick his mind plays upon himself, but later on he realises that they are his own hands, suggestive of his deep rooted desire to grab and eat everything. He is of course seen to get disappointed with his own mind but he concentrates all his efforts on survival, or insists on his atemporal experience between death and hereafter, which he (and the implied reader) does not recognize as such. Thus, other animal imagery such as maggots, birds, gulls, snails or mussels (66, 74) are just a means of expanding the boundaries of the dark room Martin finds himself entrapped in, and a means of creating a solid ground of nature to exist in. In this way, he can find a way to escape from darkness or the "black lightening" which is always threatening to take him.

At the end of Chapter 1 it is implied that Martin has died: "[The sea] no longer licked his face. There was a pattern in front of him that occupied all the space under the arches. It meant nothing. The sea nuzzled under his arm again. He lay still" (*PM*, 23).[44] Yet, the story leads the implied reader to the threshold of uncertainty and produces a variety of meanings, which the novel owes much to its ongoing resonance. The implied author suspends information till the end of the narrative and the implied reader keeps the implication of death in mind throughout his/her reading activity. With the character's earlier death, all the pictures, scenes, reminiscences, imagery, verbal games turn into materials subject to the atemporal realm of the afterlife. In this sense, Martin's world seems to be the spiritual world of purgatory. However, this interpretation might "bring too much baggage" with it and can reduce the novel to a mere Christian allegory (Whitehead, 42). Whitehead states that "it is not simply the world of subjectivity as opposed to the objective world and not the world of the mind (or psyche) as opposed to body" (42). These cannot give a complete account of Martin's situation (42). Interpretations of this narrative and its themes seem to some extent shaped by myths. Yet, it seems wise to suggest that plurality in perspective is as significant an aspect as its universality in *PM* and the novel attempts to grip the idea of universality not in the distant

mythical past but in the realm of atemporality, which is a "point without dimension" or "timeless point" (Whitehead, 43). The act of narration is not limited to a mere observation of the events from without. The narration is also decelerated in the Genettean sense, because it deals with atemporality which cannot be expressed through conventional clock-time units. Therefore, the framing narrative is accompanied by the acts of focalizations which helps perceive "the imperceptible" objects/events such as dreams, illusions, intellectual games, reasoning and subconscious imagery. Thus, Martin's intellectual and spiritual "purgatory" is made visible both from without and from within, from the authorial perspective and from that of the character. In this secular purgatory the subject/centre appears to belong nowhere but the implied reader views the character trying to build up a ground on which he can exist. The centre, to which "all paths lead back" (Kinkead-Weekes and Gregor, 124), is concerned with both consciousness and unconsciousness. Redpath, furthermore, finds the word "centre" the most significant element in the narration, but the references to "window"[45] also present a recurrent motif throughout the narration and this image closely relates to the terminology employed in the present analysis. Windows of focalizations nurture the narrative in terms of meaning(s) and help the external narrator-focalizer open up brand new perspectives before the implied reader.

The interior monologues or flow of thoughts within the narrative call into question the objectivity of the narration and the narrative seems infected with unreliable subjectivity. But such narrative parts expand the spatial vision of the novel. From the beginning, Martin's interior monologues cover a considerable part of the narrative, sometimes exclaiming "help", defying his situation with "I won't die", surrendering to it with "I shall never get away from this rock" or pondering over his existence and identity "I am who I was" (131), and sometimes delivering longer speeches like:

> It's like those nights when I was a kid, lying awake thinking the darkness would go on for ever. And I couldn't go back to sleep because of the dream of the whatever it was in the cellar coming out of the corner. I'd lie in the hot. […] What's the matter with me? I am adult. I know

> what's what. There is no connection between me and the kid in the cellar, none at all. (138-139)

Such interior monologues also violate the chronology of the events and present the implied reader with a great deal of information about the character. The scenes, in which many dialogues that take place are displayed through the mind of the character, similarly play an important role in the narrative design of *PM*. They are vivid scenes from the past, referred to as "pictures" (30), "busy scenes" (83) or "trailers out of the past" (138) from Martin's perspective. In such scenes, the temporal interval between the story and the narrating act is radically shortened, and the action of the story has almost turned into the action of narrating/thinking/displaying, thus to sheer discourse. But the character warns himself about them: "Trailers out of the past are all right but I must be careful when I see things that never happened, like—I have water or food and intelligence and shelter" (*PM*, 139). As Mendilow suggests "recapturing the past free from time and its effects [is] to make events timeless" (135).

4.3. Character Development through Focalizations and Subnarratives

The metadiegetic parts of any narrative are expected to have certain functions in the narrative, such as the explanatory function that corresponds to a relation of causality that serves to make a cause-effect relationship in a story and clarify the plot. In *PM* there is no plot in the conventional sense. In *PM*, sense perceptions are very important productions of the interpretive intelligence and play a primary role in the narrative. It is seen that careful juxtaposition and the repetition of certain motifs and imagery are particularly created through embedded narratives and focalizations, which serve to enrich the character development as well as the narrative structure. This intense use of imagery vividly turns the narrative discourse into a vivid and visual revelation. Frank Kermode suggests that the implied reader reads *PM* like a poem, because it "combines image with reference" and invites the implied reader to consider the "totality of the imaginative act" (Kermode, 60, 62). *PM* therefore reveals that the imagination

is as important a human attribute as the intellect, and the two are interwoven in the case of Martin. Samuel Hynes states that *PM* is "so tightly and intricately interwoven as to read like a difficult poem; one must attend to its symbols and images in order to understand its narrative action, and indeed there is little that one could call plot in the book" (129). It can be inferred, considering Hynes's remarks, that in this novel, the metadiegetic narratives do not completely function as explanatory narrative pieces but as vivid images of the suffering self just like a symbol depicting the human condition in general (Gindin's "metaphor for essential humanity" [41]), and these symbolic units of narration overwhelm the curtailed plot in the narrative.

Throughout the narrative it is seen that two Martins are developed: "the centre" on a bare rock struggling against death to exist at least intellectually, and "the Pincher" who has no belief in anything but "eating up" and "stealing from" others. The former stands for the insistence on an ultimately independent form of existence and mere (un)consciousness; the latter for lovelessness, self-centredness and greed, which is understood as having been the mainspring of his past life.[46] The identity of Christopher Hadley Martin is not immediately clear and his personality is clarified through subnarratives mostly initiated by different types of focalizations, which sometimes reflect the blurred perception of the character and sometimes produce analeptic narratives. Therefore, as Friedman states, the main narrative illustrating Martin's desperate struggle against death is "punctuated by flashbacks" (52). So, the implied reader should follow up the development of the character step by step considering the narrative levels and levels of focalizations because the information about him is held back to some extent and only gradually given, and then turned upside down. The episodes presented through the mind of the character, argues Friedman, reveal the "essential Martin". He states that "Martin undergoes a purgatorial ordeal that shapes the novel into a worst-case scenario for modern man" (51).

Martin's present ordeal on the rock is interwoven with confrontations with his misdeeds of the past. The multilayered narrative portrays Martin's present

situation and mindset along with the scenes from the past. Therefore the attentive reader should carry out a careful reading. In the following passage, for example, it is seen that Martin tries to build up a stone cliff. In this structurally circular passage, narrated in the first degree, the implied reader finds Martin on the rock. In the second degree there is a flashback in which a dialogue is embedded. And then the levels are reinstated respectively. This multilayered structure complicates the narrative but makes it possible to develop Martin as the protagonist of the present and the antagonist (as Kinkead-Weekes and Gregor suggest) of the past:

> [1]
> The horizon remained empty.
> "I must get a sphere. Perhaps I could beat the nearest to it with another stone until it rounds. Stone mason as well. Who was it cut stone cannon-balls? Michael Angelo? But I must look for a very round stone. Never a dull moment. Just like Itma."
> He got up and went down to the sea. He [...] He stroked the smooth stuff with one finger.
> [2]
> They called that paint Barmaid's Blush and splashed on gallons with unexpert and casual hand of the wartime sailor. [...] The ship rolled heavily and here was Nat descending the upper ladder [...] Nat saluting as ever off balance, but this time held in position by one arm and two legs.
> [3]
> "Wotcher, Nat. Happy in your work?"
> [...]
> "Zig coming in ten seconds? I've got her."
> "See you again at the witching hour."
> "Port fifteen. Midships. Steady."
> [2]
> He looked briefly round the convoy and then aft. Nat was there, tediously in his usual place. [...]
> [1]
> The mouth opened.
> "Carry on." (99-102)

Martin, the protagonist, who is concerned with areas of existence beyond the boundaries of life, attempts to explore the limits of individual power to insist on being. Martin is seen to reject the idea of death which, to a "God-resisting

soul," means destruction of self and identity to God-resisting soul. According to most spiritual teachings, however, destruction of individuality is necessary for salvation. In an interview with Archie Campbell on BBC, in 1956, Golding described Martin as follows:

> To achieve salvation, individuality −the persona− must be destroyed. But suppose the man is nothing but greed? His original spirit, God-given, the Scintillans Dei, is hopelessly obscured by his thirst for separate individual life. What can he do at death but refuse to be destroyed? Inhabit a world he invents from half-remembered scraps of physical life, a rock which is nothing but the memory of an aching tooth-ache? To a man greedy for life, tooth-ache is preferable to extinction, and that is the terrible secret of purgatory, it is all the world that the God-resisting soul cannot give up (Qtd., in Oldsey, 83).

From the narrator-focalizer's perspective he is portrayed as an isolated, reduced and shrunken persona. At the very beginning of the narrative in *PM,* in an unclear setting the character is found struggling against the drifting waves of the ocean: "He was struggling in every direction; he was the centre of the writhing and kicking knot of his own body. There was no up and down, no light and no air. He felt his mouth open of itself and the shrieked word burst out" (7). Here, the seeing/perceiving eye shifts from the narrator-focalizer to the character-focalizer, Martin, who becomes sometimes the object of focalization. With the first sentence, the invisible narrator-focalizer views the character from without, as "struggling in every direction," and the perspective changes suddenly: "The centre of the writhing and kicking knot" (*PM*, 7) becomes the pivotal axis along which the events are seen. The words "up," "down," "light" and "air" are the indicators of this shift in focalization, also portraying subjectivity and self-experience. In the following paragraph, for example, the statement "there was nothing but black" directly communicates the character's self-experience, which is accompanied by other sense-perceptions: "choking welter," "burning water," "water hard in the throat and mouth" "right direction," "turbines screaming in the ears" (7-8). In a way, the narrator yields to the focalizer and when the implied reader hears the voice of the narrator, he perceives the event from the character-focalizer's

perspective by definition. All these sense-perceptions are signs of his subjectivity and the ordeal he is confined to. He is ostensibly saved by his lifebelt and cast alive on a rock after rolling for some time in the Atlantic.

As the novel progresses, however, whether Martin is alive or not becomes less clear and focalizing the purely isolated world and mind of the character again turns out to be a useful strategy for exploring the human condition:

> He put his head down and made sucking noises. Then he lay still.
> The place in which he had found water was like a little cave.
>
> The floor of the trench sloped down gently under water so that this end of the pool was shallow. There was room for him to lie with his elbows […] The roof stone lay across at an angle and the farther end of the cave was not entirely stopped up. There was a small hole high up by the roof, full of daylight and a patch of sky. The light from the sky was reflected in and from the water so that faint lines quivered over the stone roof. The water was drinkable but there was no pleasure in taste. […] The water did not satisfy thirst so much as allay it.[…] Now that his one and a half eyes were adjusted to the light he could see there was a deposit under the water, reddish and slimy. The deposit was not hard but easily disturbed so that where he had drunk, the slime was coiling up, drifting about, hanging, settling. He watched dully.
>
> Presently he began to mutter.
> "Rescue. See about rescue." (60)

Here it is seen that Martin is focalized from without and within. From the outer perspective, he looks thirsty (sucking noises) and his body is motionless and his sight is dwindled. Nevertheless, his perceiving the outside world is revealed and the shallow water, a patch of sky, the reflection of light on that water and on the stone roof ("faint lines of light"), the taste and colour of the water indicate that the character has an active mind in his paralyzed body. These signs of focalization also prove that he is obsessed with the idea of rescue as his muttering points out. Later, his own speculations underline this idea:

> The end to be desired is rescue. For that, the bare minimum necessary is survival. I must keep this body going. I must give it drink and food and shelter. When I do that it does not matter if the job is well done or not so long as it is done at all. So long as the thread of life is unbroken it will connect a future with the past for all this ghastly interlude. Point one. (*PM*, 81)

It is frequently observed that Martin exercises the rules of logic and from the beginning he tries to keep his belief in himself: "I am intelligent" (32). The narrative strategy of the novel aims to reveal this intelligent quality of the character. There is a passive creature lying still on the rock, who is sometimes observed "snoring" (31) but "the consciousness [is] moving and poking about among the pictures and revelations, among the shape-sounds and the disregarded feelings like an animal ceaselessly examining its cage" (31-32). His examination leads him to numerous scenes and pictures which also point to his sensitivity as well as intelligence. His intellect and sensitivity connect his present situation with his past, and in the image of fire they are melted:

> Both the sun and the fires were far away from him. He saw the red silt holding back the fresh water, a double handful of red sweets, an empty horizon.
> "I shall live!"
> […]
> He saw how many months a man must endure before he was warmed by the brighter light of spring. He watched the sun for months without thought or identity. He saw it from many angles, through windows of trains or from fields. He confused its fires with other fires. One of these fires was most insistent that here was reality and to be watched. The fire was behind the bars of a grate. He found that the grate was in a room then everything became familiar out of the past (69).

Frank Kermode argues that Martin is a "shrinking identity" and "declares for madness rather than extinction, intellect rather than love" (Kermode, 61). He says "there is no centre of sanity in madness" and tries to "fasten the attention away from the interior blackness" (181). His helpless situation is again portrayed through narrative levels and focalizations:

(1) Because of what I did I am an outsider and alone.
(2) The centre endured a progress through an alley, across another road, a quadrangle, climbed bare wooden stairs.
(3) It sat by a fire and all the bells of Oxford tolled for the reservoir that overflowed and the sea roared in the room.
(4) The centre twisted the unmanliness out of its face but the ungovernable water ran and dripped down the cheeks.
(5) "I am so alone. I am so alone!"
(6) Slowly, the water dried. (7) Time stretched out, like the passage of time on a rock in the middle of the sea.
(8) The centre formulated a thought.
(9) Now there is no hope. (10) There is nothing. (11) If they would only look at me, or speak− if I could only be part of something−
(11) Time stretched on indifferently.
(12) There was sound of feet on the stairs (181-182)

In (1) internal focalization reveals Martin's ultimate isolation and loneliness. It is suggested that he is nevertheless strong enough to bear his responsibility for his past actions. From within, from his own perspective his predicament implies some sense of respect. In (2) and (3) Martin is referred to as the centre (with a personal pronoun "it"), which implies that he is reduced to an entity without a body or to a mere (un)consciousness. The centre is focalized from without by the narrator-focalizer, which also signs a fragment from the past. In this scene shown in (2) and (3), the wooden stairs of the college in Oxford imply the living memory producing subnarratives. In (4) there is a shift in narrative level and the focus is at the present physical situation of the body (unmanliness). This can be a clue to his physical death but the (un)consciousness persists. In (5), focalization shifts, and his persistence manifests itself in a silent exclamation of agony. In (6), the level of focalization is reinstated to reveal his physical condition again. In (7) the narrator-focalizer reflects on how the centre has been experiencing the passage of time on the rock. This experience is accomplished with the thoughts given in (9), (10) and (11). In (12) there is a shift in narrative level and a return to the scene pictured in (2) and (3).

According to Redpath's classification, the centre of focus on the first level is the survival of the "centre" through the past, whose basic and disappointing experiment resembles that of a "successful maggot" doomed to eat and be eaten

(*PM*, 90). Here, the so-called centre (Martin refuses to acknowledge and submit to any centre beyond himself) is constructed through reminiscences and stream of consciousness (*PM*, 76), which Redpath calls "writing" (147).[47] He refers to that which considers "a chunk of rockleaf" as "a considerable book" (*PM*, 177), where Martin notices an "engraving" on the imaginary book, "it is a tree," which "[has] made a pattern but not words" (177). Here there is a sign of self-reflection, referring to words and their power: "[Words] would have killed him [Martin] immediately" (*PM*, 177). "If there were words," says Redpath, "they would have been written, which would prove fatal" (148). He adds

> the irony is that every thing in *PM* is written –the pattern, the rockleaf, and the rock. Writing would signify the destruction of Martin's centre because, as Barthes points out "writing is the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin. Writing is the neutral, composite, oblique space where our subject slips away, the negative where all identity is lost" (148).

Here lies a questioning of being and existence, stripped of all its elements and reduced to a mere name cut off from the very being itself. The irony here refers to a modern understanding of the human being as mere identity:

> How can I have a complete identity without a mirror? That is what has changed me. Once I was a man with twenty photographs of myself– myself as this and that with the signature scrawled across the bottom right-hand corner as a stamp and seal. Even when I was in the Navy there was that photograph in my identity card so that every now and then I could look and see who I was. Or perhaps I did not even need to look, but was content to wear the card next to my heart, secure in the knowledge that it was there, proof of me in the round (132)

It is seen that the implied author (and the narrator-focalizer) makes indirect and circuitous comments on the issue by using the character's interior monologues.[48] For this reason, for example in *PM*, the attentive reader does not hear a "narrator as such" making morally evaluative attestation or comments, but nevertheless s/he can discover such indirect comments, particularly in the free indirect speeches and interior monologues throughout the novel.

Martin is also given different names, which refers to different periods or aspects of his life. He is nicknamed Pincher but the name is also an indication that he is the implied author's embodiment of greed, who has "uncompromisingly and increasingly striven to grab the lot–to pinch is to steal." (Friedman, 51). His full name is Christopher Hadley Martin but, revealingly, he hardly ever uses the truly 'Christian' name Christopher. After the middle of the narrative, when he is drowned and swallowed up by "the globe of darkness" (129) he screams:

> He stopped suddenly, then began again.
> "Chris. Christopher! Christopher Hadley Martin–"
> The words dried up.
> There was an instrument of examination, a point that he knew existed. There were sounds that came out of the lower part of a face. They had no meaning attached to them. They were useless as tins thrown out with the lids buckled back.
> "Christopher, Christopher!"
> He reached out with both arms […] filled with terror.
> "Oh, my God" (129)

The narrator-focalizer rarely refers to the character as "Chris," "Christopher" or "Christopher Hadley Martin." When s/he does so, it suggests that the character remembers somebody calling him "Chris" or "Christopher" or that the character/protagonist is estranged from himself and trying to reconstruct himself as a respectable identity and frequently asks questions to feel alive. The consciousness moves about the pictures and revelations, among the shape sounds to find even a "thought" so that he can infer he is "intelligent" (*PM,* 32). Accordingly, the following remarks show the character's psychological state or mindset, which not only illustrates his loneliness but also presents it as a reason for his identity crisis:

> How can I have a complete identity without a mirror? […] I could spy myself and assess the impact of Christopher Hadley Martin on the world. I could find assurance of my solidity in the bodies of the other people by warmth and caress and triumphant flesh […] there were other people to describe me to myself —they fell in

> love with me, they applauded me, they caressed this body, they defined it for me (132).

The words and names have no meaning in this situation; they are not attached to any consistent idea in which the character can feel himself and his integrity. From the beginning of the novel, the implied reader cautiously picks up second degree narratives so that s/he can integrate such pieces into a whole person:

> "I'm so alone! Christ! I'm so alone!"
> Black. A familiar feeling, a heaviness round the heart, a reservoir which any moment might flood the eyes now and for so long, strangers to weeping.
> […]
> The center was thinking- I'm alone so alone!
> […]
> Because of what I did I am an outsider and alone.
> The center endured a progress… (181)

Martin invents his own purgatory, although using such religious terminology may be inappropriate, because he himself does not believe in purgatory. Therefore, Friedman claims, "when he died it was not presented to him in overtly theological terms" (54). He obviously refuses to accept the "inalterable fact of dissolution" (54) and even after death, he continues to defy God as he did before he died (until the last chapter the implied reader actually remains unsure whether Martin has already died or not. On the rock, Martin takes over the role of God, which, as the attentive reader has already seen, can be conceived as a parody of genesis. This is like Martin's "forging in the crucible of his ego a world of his own" (Friedman, 56). Martin is not behind his eyes looking out. He tries to overcome "the feelings like an animal ceaselessly examining his cage" (*PM*, 32). Kinkead-Weekes states that "for 'pincher Ego' the design of the universe is a vast world of terrible darkness, closed by the desperate inventiveness of its senses five" (69).

It is the framing narrative that relies on the inner experience of the centre busying himself with creation and writing/naming, which is presented through the narrator's focalization from within. These parts provide the implied reader with

valuable data about the character, whose struggle turns out to be a one-man show because the implied reader finds Pincher's shrunk personality not reflected through his relationship with other human beings, but only in relation to hostile nature, and to his bottomless desire for existing. As stated earlier, the ravenous ego tries to create a world of his own, which is in fact a rock, and imagines different corners on it, even naming them: Oxford Circus, Piccadilly, Leicester Square (*PM*, 85-86) Thus, Martin is seen to "invoke the familiar London landmarks that preserve in death the illusion of life" (Friedman, 53). It will be understood later for certain that this is an imaginary rock, and the world created by the centre is an absurd universe for Martin, who considers the rock as "a defence against the destruction of his centre" (Redpath, 146). It is again described by using the words connected with eating: "A single point of rock, peak of a mountain range, one tooth set in the ancient jaw of a sunken world" (83). The concrete realization of the rock, although it draws the implied reader's riveted attention, will be proved to be radically false and 'made up' because "it not only lacks, but actively seeks to evade, an even deeper kind of 'insight'" (Kinkead-Weekes, 1986: 68).

The narrative illustrates a paradox because Christopher Hadley Martin had/has no belief in anything, but now he needs most to believe in what can be considered to be absurdity. Through focalizations, transposed speeches and interior monologues the need for belief is seen but this is belief in the importance of his integrity, his identity, his existence and his own life; not in love or God. The implied reader sees him playing God, he thinks he was created in the image of God and therefore has a freedom of choice. He is determined to use this freedom, insists on organising everything around his centre and never admits that he can be reduced to a pair of claws. Although he is like "a tiny figure floating upright in a jam jar" (8), the centre still declares his autonomy and "resists" (200).

From within, the implied reader goes on watching Martin's playing many imaginary roles: The Maggot, Robinson Crusoe, Prometheus, Atlas and Sisyphus, who best depicts and epitomizes Martin's present condition because he is in a way

condemned eternally to roll a stone up a slope only to have it roll down again and again as he nears the top. He "tries on a series of heroic roles in an increasingly desperate search for an identity to live by. Each is a projection of an unregenerate ego –all that remains of Pincher Martin" (Friedman, 54) For example, when Martin identifies himself with Prometheus, his defiance of God expressed in the exclamation "I spit on your compassion!" (199) is "no more than a vulgar parody of Prometheus's supreme denial of Zeus." (Friedman, 54). Hynes states that Martin as centre is "fiercely acting out his ego" (1987 [1976]: 128). The implied reader may feel that Martin is a lonely but heroic survivor because he never gives up clinging to life and defends his existence against nature and refuses annihilation. His Prometheus-like defiance of fate and God sounds, perhaps, admirable. But when the implied reader, with the help of windows of focalization and flashbacks breaking into the temporal framework, learns a lot more about Martin's past that establishes the character, he turns out to be the opposite of an admirable or heroic figure.

The multilayered narrative structure makes it possible to view the scenes and pictures from Martin's past, where Christopher Hadley Martin really appears to be a "Pincher" in every sense of the word. The recurrent flashbacks resemble "Chinese boxes," a motif from used by Pincher himself (95). The implied reader, with the help of the memories mostly presented through focalizations from within, builds up a character that exemplifies "a fallen man more than most" and "a type of depravity" (Kermode, 61).

In this context, Pete's story of the maggot presented in one of the subnarratives is also highly ironic. The Maggot can be an important metaphor to describe Pincher, too, because maggots first eat the thing they live on and then each other until only one all-eating maggot is left alive. Pincher Martin was like a maggot in the past and needless to say, Pincher Martin has been clearly the fattest maggot of all his life. Through subnarratives, it is seen that Martin turns into a ravenous Pincher, whom the word "greed" can best describe. As he was a professional actor before joining the navy, there is an ironic sense in the narrative. Boyd states that Pincher Martin's "last act on the ship is the attempted murder of

his friend Nat, a very damnable last act indeed" (53). Martin is portrayed as having created a stage for himself in his mind, the rock, and playing his masterpiece. Irony is strengthened by the scene where he was given a role of "greed" in a morality play in his past because Pete thinks that "greed is simply you [him]" (119). The very incarnation of greed is illustrated throughout subnarratives where Pincher Martin is portrayed as a self-centred personality always betraying his friends and workmates. Through fragments, pictures and scenes from the past, the implied reader is faced with the evil in Martin and recognizes the fact that he is a real Pincher. As the name suggests, he steals from all around him. His frustrated ambition to win a motorcycle race, for example, crippled his friend Peter. He also appears to have abused the women (Helen, Sybil, Mary) as well as the men around him. It is seen that sexual manipulation was a means of "exercising his power over others" (Redpath, 150).

Hynes states that "strictly speaking, there is no character in the novel except Pincher […] Pincher has regarded them not as separate human beings but as things to be devoured" ("On Pincher Martin," 130-131): It is seen that Pincher Martin was "born with his mouth open" and "both hands out to grab" (*PM*, 120). However, it seems that before falling into the sea, he never thought about his own greed:

> "And I never remembered! Never thought of it […]!" Or not since before I was blown off the bloody bridge anyway.
> […]Killed and eaten. And of course, eating with the mouth was only the gross expression of what was a universal process. You could eat with your cock or with your fists, or with your voice. You could eat with hobnailed boots or buying and selling or marrying and begetting or cuccolding−
> Cuccolding reminded him. He turned from the mirror… (88)

It is seen in the imagery associated with "eating" and pain ("the aching tooth") that all are inventions of the mind, successfully portrayed through a narrative strategy that foregrounds the immediacy of the sight and insight. This strategy helps to investigate the reactions of the human being when reduced to

mere (un)consciousness. This is a stripping away of the ties with the external world, and turning the subject into something floating in a "jam jar." The narrative aims to accomplish a difficult task in fact, because it has to deal with the unreliable inventions of the mind. These present Martin as Pincher, an ultimately greedy and selfish man (represented by the images of mouth), who is doomed to suffering in the hell of his own mind. He has been merely interested in satisfying his own "appetites" (food, sex, power) and now he thinks that he lives in his own mouth (devours himself in a way) and disintegrates into his own eponymous grasping symbol (a pair of claws) before the final annihilation. Actually, Martin attempts to "cheat death by creating his own reality" (Friedman 53). The implied reader is presented with mere illusion of life and Martin's imaginary world. Friedman argues that this illustration of man's nature is "to make the universe in the image of [one's] own mind" (57). Redpath interprets the tooth metaphor, protruding from the mouth of the sea and getting rotten according to Freud and he sees it as a symbol of castration. It is seen that all the incursions including limpets (*PM*, 39), rocks as teeth (30, 78, 90, 91), a red lobster (111, 112, 167), and guano in pools (174) are mere devices to make Martin convinced of his survival, and similarly the rock can be considered as a defence against the destruction of his centre.[49] The rock as tooth, eating and swallowing, is horribly reflected when Martin is swallowed by the sea and literally 'thrown up' or even ironically excreted on to Campbell's island- "he is ejected as waste on to the island" (Redpath, 145-146). Thus, "a pattern, which imposes on the implied reader a de-centreing of the self and forces him to revise his [the character's] conception of relationship to the universe" is designated according not only to textual elements but also extratextual ones. Now the character is "chewing" words, not people: "I will speak in here where my words resound and significant sounds assure me of my own identity" (*PM*, 87).

Through the chronologically distorted scenes from the past, it is understood that particularly his relation to Nathaniel is significant. Just after the torpedo hits, while wrestling with the ocean, the implied reader through focalization from within hears a name: "Nat! Nathaniel! For Christ's sake!

Nathaniel! Help!" (13) He was going to kill Nathaniel (the implied reader later understands this) but the torpedo upset his plan. He regrets that he did not act ten seconds earlier. Even in that situation, within the stretched moment of death, his words indicate his evil. When focalization shifts, the narrative turns to Martin as a body rolling in the sea:

> "Help! Nathaniel! Help−!" And I gave the right orders too. If I'd done it ten seconds earlier I'd be a bloody hero− […] Must have hit us bang under the bridge. And I gave the right order. And I get blown to buggery.
>
> The snarl fixed itself, worked on the wooden face till the upper lip was lifted and chattering teeth bared (15).

His guilt and pain is expected to be unbearable because when they were aboard ship Pincher Martin was about to "pinch" Nathaniel's life. Nathaniel is the symbol of goodness and purity; but, as Pincher Martin denies the value of these virtues, he cannot stand Nathaniel and the things he represents. Furthermore, through the flashbacks interwoven with the account of his struggle on the imaginary rock, the implied reader learns that Pincher Martin also attempted to seduce Mary Lovell, Nathaniel's girlfriend. After he failed to seduce her, he thought of killing her. Hynes states that the "existence of Nathaniel is interwoven with Pincher's in the way that good is interwoven with evil" (131). Boyd, on the other hand, argues that Nathaniel is "not merely a prophet and purveyor of wisdom but a fool" and his "extraordinary height and slenderness makes him ridiculous and awkward" (58). It is clear that Nathaniel, with his selfless personality, is the opposite of Pincher Martin. One of the most striking scenes reveals this conflict, where Nathaniel advises Martin to learn how to die, "the technique of dying into heaven" (*PM*, 71). The inner struggle of the centre throughout the narrative, however, presents Martin's "technique" of resistance, and highlights Pincher's rejection of death, Christian selflessness, God, heaven and even hell. Nathaniel says "without form and void. You see? A sort of black lightening, destroying everything that we call life" (*PM*, 70). But, it can be argued tha the whole narration is dealing with Pincher Martin's response to Nathaniel's "black lightening" which he dismisses from the very beginning to the end. That there finally remains only his

consciousness and his claws shows that he never gives up clinging to his own existence: “The centre is unaware of anything but the claws and the threat” (201). It is the threat of death (destruction of body) and void (destruction of mind).

4.4. Reversing the Message and Closing the Narrative upon Itself

The complicated narrative technique renders *PM* first of all a vivid survival adventure with a simple but weird plot that does not necessarily compel a moral interpretation relating to Martin’s spiritual struggle against nonexistence. Its originality particularly lies in its coda, which reverses and subordinates all that has been told until that point. The coda suggests that what the implied reader has been taking as objectively true is in fact false. This gimmick in the end of the story proves that Martin’s imagined escape is a kind of illusion after the death moment. In fact, “a re-reading of *PM* forces the recognition that it is a post mortem narrative, and not a moment-of-death narrative” (Surette, 205).

In the last chapter Captain Davidson (an entirely new character, on the highest narrative level) receives back poor Martin’s corpse from a Mr. Campbell who has found it. It is understood from the Captain’s statement that “he didn’t even have time to kick off his seaboots” (208). This shows that Martin’s physical sufferings probably lasted a very short time. Captain Davidson tries to comfort Campbell by this remark, but the implied reader’s struggle starts here. This is a struggle to understand, to position everything in its true place; but the implied author undermines the previous message, because the attentive reader will remember that Martin has kicked off his sea boots earlier (see *PM*, 10). Rereading the novel after this tricky ending it is seen, however, that Martin must have died even earlier (In the first chapter, there is another suggestion of his death but the implied reader at first cannot understand whether he died or fainted; page 23). So, like *IN*, *PM* burdens the implied reader with a double reading until the coda. According to this, the narrative can be read as the story of a wounded man on a bare rock, who is struggling for survival and faced with his past; and can be

received as a story of a soul rejecting the ultimate destruction of his existence and fighting against the idea of death.

The coda then turns out to be the implied reader's "black lightning" which was a sign that led Pincher Martin to believe that supernatural forces were trying to end his life. Black lightening also stands for the "void" in the form of compassion because it makes no sense to Martin and has no value. Ironically, Martin's fears certainly come true, but in another context.[50] Here the supernatural force, in a way, appears to be the implied author's imagination suspending the implied reader who cannot decide whether to identify with (taking him as a protagonist) or criticize Martin (regarding him as an antagonist). Thus not only the eponymous hero, but also all that is perceived through his agency is devastated by the tricky ending of the novel.

The so-called "trick ending" may not perplex the attentive reader as surprises of a text can never achieve ultimate closure, and s/he knows that no story is able to reach an end. What is remarkable here is that the narrative itself challenges its own reliability and indirectly draws attention to its status as a narrative. The limited freedom and autonomy of speaking for itself, hitherto rendered to the character, is therefore proved to be a delusion, all of which are the inventions of an external imagination represented by the external narrator-focalizer positioned above the lower narrative levels. The story as a narrative of purgation, physical survival, psychological trial and ideological self questioning cannot reach the point at which redemption, resurrection, salvation or revival is achieved. The only victory is that of the narrator, the only resurrection belongs to the voice of author-ity and monitor-ity it serves. What is striking here is that the narrative can produce different levels and perspectives conflicting sometimes (may be always, though partly) with each other.

The sense of irony in the coda is twofold: First, the implied reader recognises that the ending invites him/her to rethink Martin's death in terms of the plot, a canvas on which the narrator has stretched all its speculations. Secondly, the implied reader recognises the well organised narrative strategy which clearly

plays tricks upon the implied reader's expectations. Martin now really dies in every sense of the word, and the implied reader becomes aware that "Martin" is just a textual element, only a sign operating only within the fictitious (con)textual frame, never to be separated from narration belonging to a different level which causes the implied reader to reevaluate the narrative or characters, and changes the novel into a religious allegory of purgatory and damnation. In this sense, Martin turns out to be a mere product of the narrating act, a narrative construct. Martin's difference is that he is not claimed to be a hero, he is presented as an anti-hero throughout the narrative, which parallels this theoretical idea. In fact, Martin is an ingenuous person (he invents things, solves problems, rethinks), courageous (he defies death and God) and, most remarkable of all, he has an increasing awareness of the struggle he is engaged in.

Some still may object to the novel's ending for different reasons, even though some others, thinking that it is interested in life after death, do not have a problem with the novel. Baker's consideration of *PM* draws attention to "Golding's first actual exploration of the after-life of a fallen man" (37). Thus Lieutenant Christopher Hadley Martin of the Royal Navy turns out to be a received symbol of "everyman". According to Baker, everything can be read as a symbol: Martin's attempt to kill Nathaniel, or the torpedo fired by the enemies to strike his ship, his being thrown overboard and having the shelter of on a rock, and being marooned in the midst of the ocean and can be read as symbolic, upon which a modern allegory can be based. Similarly, his remaining there, isolated, for seven days can be viewed as an allusion to God's creation of the world (123-168). There are many other examples in the story supporting such readings but what puts them into a coherent whole is the narrative fiction itself, owing to which all these interpretations can be possible. The narrative on a lower diegetic level and from a relatively less distant and more subjective point of view, allows itself to reflect on Martin's life but finally decides to wash off that subjective voice/mood of the rock in a storm-like gimmick. At this point, the narrator undermines his/her own narration and it seems that this reversal signals the narrative's self-

deconstruction, for the implied reader can no longer read the same text as a mere story of a suffering character.

The rock is actually that which is an embedded text, a textual shelter for the character, his interior monologues, his dreams, flashbacks, past, present, hereafter (may be), inner struggle and questioning, acts of mind and cognitive stages transparent for some time, or the implied reader is made to think so, within a covering text(ual ocean). Focalizations shift perspective, the voice constantly changes its tone, the narration resumes from a higher level and then the reliability of the narrator and the information conveyed so far becomes more ambiguous.

Baker notes that "at the end of the novel, it becomes evident to the implied reader that Martin has not actually been marooned on the rock for seven days, but that was actually a hallucination of his soul" (127). The interpretations however cannot be restricted and especially two basic theories about what actually could have happened in the story can be formulated from a thematic perspective. In the first, Martin's life flashes before his eyes as experiences through subnarratives; and, in the second one, Martin's soul is thought of as being in purgatory, just before he realizes that he is already dead, which requires the text to be rewritten. However, this is an intentional confusion created by the implied author. It is the most important strategy of regulating the narrative information, and draws the riveted attention of the implied reader to the ultimate presence of an organisational mind behind the novel. In any event, Martin as character can be considered just as a tool of narration as well as a tool for the character. Thus, Martin as a textual construct and his purgatory gain a new status, which is crafted proficiently through narrative strategies.[51]

It can be argued therefore that Barthes' mimetic effect, in this case has turned into an "effective mimesis" in which a real Martin is portrayed and his true story is told. For example, one of the early critics, Hilary Corke tried hard to "evade the literal sense of this uncomfortable fable and even suggested that Golding should alter the ending" (Corke, 80). This seems to have overlooked that it is a narrative produced by using certain narrative strategies which make possible

various meanings. Some deplored the fact that Golding remained firm. He states that “Corke is, I suppose, a straightforward twentieth-century humanist, and this is not what I am, I don't think, and this isn't what the book is about. No, I wouldn't change the ending" (Biles 70-71). Corke’s demand for the change and Golding’s response that “I wouldn’t change the ending” point to the fact that what is primarily under consideration is the narrative style of a story, and by doing this they imply that narrative strategies have a determining influence over the text. Historically talking, even if the author changed a text, the previous one would haunt its successor. Once it is produced it finds a way to survive, to revive, to engender, to manipulate and to reproduce itself and its meanings (Allen, 19, 27, 39).

Briefly, *PM* plays not only with temporality, but also with the very notion of reality. From the very beginning, the novel violates the borders of reality and revels in exerting intellectual and unconscious speculation. The reader in any case cannot make sure whether what is being told (or portrayed) is real or not. Most strikingly, at the end of the novel, the reader recognises that s/he has been reading a post-mortem narrative dealing almost completely with atemporal realm of the unconsciousness. This novel, therefore, is one of the novels that epitomizes the use and exploitation of focalizations from within, which provides the implied reader with a great deal of information but on the other hand burdens him/her with attentive reading. With its extremely reduced setting, and overstated sense of isolation, *PM* attempts to force the limits of consciousness and unconsciousness and searches for a way of presentation to reveal the character’s ordeal. It also involves the implied reader in this ordeal, and, as this dissertation has analysed, by means of the technique of focalization, the character, the overshrunk and overreduced being of Martin (“the centre”) is projected before the eyes of the implied reader.

The narrative technique, beyond the limitations of the pure omniscient narration and shortcomings of a fixed perspective, makes the narrative more

flexible, more fluid, more visual on the one hand, and more complicated, more unreal, more unreliable on the other. Perspective is first pinned to that of the so called "centre," (the (un)consciousness of Martin) which never gives in to death, struggling to keep his ties with reality and with his past, which expands the perspective to various reminiscences and vivid scenes invented by the present consciousness. As already shown, these reminiscences, scenes, pictures, visions and thoughts are revealed through narrative levels and levels of focalizations, which break up temporal linearity, as well. Therefore, the implied reader perceives Martin and his make-believe world along with Martin himself (as internal-focalizer). By using this technique, the centre is portrayed as reflecting itself with its painful struggle for existence and strong desire for the denial of superpowers like God.

In *PM* things flow through the mind of the character by the agency of an invisible third person narrator (narrator-focalizer). For this reason, many thoughts, pictures, images and dialogues that are produced through the (un)consciousness of the character make up subnarratives. Thoughts, visions, dreams, pictures or scenes make sense after the reception of these second degree narratives illustrating Martin's past. Martin's desperate struggle for survival on a physical world is extended by these embedded sections (analepses) and the implied reader is presented with the real Martin: a pincher. His physical struggle turns into a purgatory in which Martin is confronted by his misdeeds. So the technique requires the implied reader to follow up the development of the character through these second degree narratives interwoven with focalizations portraying the present (un)consciousness. The centre, therefore, allows the reader to go further, from Martin to Pincher Martin.

The technical analysis concludes that the narrative technique does not only make it possible to explore moral or existential issues but also epitomizes the issues of author-ity and what I have called the monitor-ity of the implied author. As is analysed in the dissertation, the embedded metadiegetic secondary narrative parts are proved to be inventions of the (un)consciousness. Therefore, *PM* not only tells the story of a character, but also tells the story of how the technique of

focalization and different levels of narration help to develop this character and how a narrative can violate its own narration, as will be seen in the case of the coda. The idea of purgatory is strengthened by a tricky ending. The so-called freedom and autonomy hitherto given to the character is, therefore, proved to be a delusion. The implied reader learns that Martin has already died before the end of chapter 1. What is crucial is that the implied author challenges his own reliability and indirectly draws attention to his status as the sole organizer, but also s/he reveals how a soul like Martin's experiences his own purgatory in the atemporal realm of afterlife, resisting death and refuting even God's compassion. This is the case in which the self resists absolute selflessness.

CHAPTER V

Search And Awakening Through Narration : *Free Fall* (1959)

This chapter has to do with *FF* and tries to show how the implied author deals with the reconstruction of self and identity through first-person retrospective narration. First it analyses the narrative elements and illustrates the position of the self-conscious narrator-focalizer. Second, it traces these elements (which are particularly related to narrative levels and focalizations) in reviewing the character in the process of becoming and the present mind-set of the narrator (the writer/storyteller/artist Sammy). Third, it demonstrates the role of focalization in reflecting the inventive mind of Sammy as narrator and character. Lastly, regarding these findings, it considers the novel with its moral question of the communication between the rational and spiritual worlds and argues that the narrator considers storytelling to be an appropriate pattern to understand the human condition.

FF is a novel of self-discovery through the act of story-telling and explores the theme of falling from innocence to experience.[52] It seems to have grown out of *PM* (Boyd, 63) but technically has some differences. As already discussed in the previous chapters, in *PM*, Martin never begs for forgiveness. However, Sammy Mountjoy, the protagonist of *FF* tries to explain his loss of freedom in a more "human way" (Boyd, 64) and tries to find an appropriate explanation. Moreover, while Martin declines compassion (the dark lightening), Sammy calls for a possibility of remedy. To achieve this, to understand his own fall and its consequences and their "influence upon his personality" (Boyd, 64), the narrator-protagonist attempts to review his own past. Thus both novels concern themselves with a retrospective glance (Monod, 133) and the protagonist is a "victim of ego" (Gindin, 48).[53]

In *FF*, the strategy of retrospection is completely mediated by a first-person narrator and the protagonist is located in a social context. The novel pictures the character within his social relationships. The role of social organisation as "a counterbalance to individual egotism" (Dickson, 58), however, fails in the case of this character. Sammy Mountjoy, the protagonist, suffers from isolation because his memory is infected with guilt. The novel portrays him as searching for the point where and when he lost his freedom: "How did I lose my freedom? I must go back and tell the story over" (6). As he is separated from his past by his "unnatural impieties" (Boyd, 63), he repeatedly asks himself the same question: when did he fall from his childhood state of grace? Gindin states that it "extends the central conception of human sin through the course of an individual life" (43). The narrative, therefore, presents us with a detailed account of Sammy's childhood and adolescence. Sammy attempts to retell his own story to find out how and when he lost his innocence. Four characters in particular play an important role in his past. His teachers Nick Shales and Miss Rowena Pringle, his love Beatrice, and Dr. Halde. Through Sammy's retrospective narrative, it is seen that these characters also stand for what appear to be opposing world views: The rational/scientific and spiritual/moral conceptions of life. His relationships with them are revealed through analeptic narratives (flashbacks) and it is seen that Sammy, like the narrative structure, is torn between these different, and conflicting, aspects of life. As the title suggests, he considers himself to have lost his direction. He searches for a "pattern"[54] that covers both spiritual and rational experiences when he experiences a dichotomy between the world of flesh and the world of spirit.

In *FF*, retrospective storytelling is not only conceived as a basic motif but also as a technique. The reviewing of the past and the exploration of the rational and spiritual are achieved through the act of storytelling, which turns into an instrumental quest for self-knowledge.[55] The act of narration serves to progress from ignorance to insight. Seeking for integrity and uniqueness in the question for knowledge about "how one becomes what one is" (*FF*, 22) can also be regarded as a call for a more suitable pattern for life. Thus, the protagonist narrator

conceives of "writing/telling" as an appropriate pattern.[56] That Sammy asks "then why am I writing this down […], reorganizing my memories until they make sense?" (7) shows that he undertakes this search (through narration) consciously. He seems aware of his status as a narrator who is privileged to select and organize. Therefore, it seems that, Sammy is both a narrator and a character. Unlike Sammy-the-character, who has already lost his freedom, Sammy-the-narrator seems to retain his power to choose and uses his "free will." This shows that, through the act of narration, he attempts to view the character in progress. Kinkead-Weekes and Gregor note that "now we hear Sammy Mountjoy asking the kind of questions the earlier novel neither asked nor could answer, seeking to discover how he became what he is" (165). They also suggest that innocence was destroyed by the character's conscious free will and now Sammy as a storyteller "deliberately and self-consciously explore[s] his past in search of a pattern of Becoming governed by choice" (165). Sammy-the-narrator objectivises himself by retelling his own story. So, what he was in the past refers, in Kinkead-Weekes and Gregor's terms, to the mode of "being" and what he is doing now refers to "becoming." The implied reader, therefore, following up the exploration carried out by Sammy-the-narrator, is invited to recognise a new possibility of freedom (becoming).

This dissertation argues that first person retrospective narration appears to be both a motif and a technique in this novel. The main strategy used by the implied author is the distinction between the protagonist as narrator and as character. The self-conscious I-narrator partly isolates himself from his self and his story. On the textual level, the protagonist is the narrator viewing the events from outside, on the story level he is a character in progress. In order to reveal and permeate the present consciousness of the narrator and the past events that happened to the character, the narrative exploits different narrative levels oscillating between the past and the present, breaks the chronology of events in order to represent the digressive mode of the remembering mind and employs different levels of focalization to permeate the visual artist's mind that is sensitive to colours and imagery. In this sense, the narrative presents the implied reader

with a complicated structure. First, the implied author writes about a character who writes, secondly, the narrator remains extradiegetic to his own story and consciously alienates himself from the object of narration, thirdly, the focalizer focalizes himself from different perspectives and produces different levels of focalizations to communicate the character's perception. Moreover and lastly, it is seen that the protagonist narrator is neither completely rational and nor devoid of spiritual resentment and pain. So, it can be argued that his self-conscious narration is an attempt to seek a bridge between the rational and the spiritual worlds.

5.1. Self-conscious Storyteller and Narrative Levels

In *FF*, the implied author employs an extradiegetic-homodiegetic first person narrator to represent the protagonist's search through the act of narration, which is both a motif and a strategy in the novel. Sammy is looking everywhere to find "the point where he lost his freedom" (*FF*, 6). This is also the moment when "human consciousness [is] caught in the free fall of its own subjectivity" (Johnson, 63). He also refers to the conscious state of his searching mind: "where this monstrous world of present consciousness began" (78). Considering the deliberate choice of the pronoun 'I', Redpath, from a structural point of view, underlines a "paradox," and claims that there are many 'I's and "eyes" in the narrative ["I, I, I … too many eyes" (Redpath, 129)]. So, Sammy-the-narrator not only searches for the point where he lost his freedom of choice, he also attempts to gain a new perspective and freedom through the act of narrating. As Redpath notes, "paradoxically, Sammy is searching for the precise point when it became possible for him to write the pronoun 'I'" (133).

The search through retrospection makes the-I-narrator an extradiegetic one because the persona who is telling the story and the one whose story is being told are not exactly the same. The attentive reader should differentiate between them. Sammy as a narrator states that "I am the one who remembers a child looking at a tree" (46-47). The significance of the novel, therefore, lies in its extraordinary use of the first person narrator (the-I-narrator). As an extradiegetic narrator, Sammy is

not involved in the story, that is, he is located at the highest narrative level. However, Sammy Mountjoy is also the protagonist of the novel. This means that, in terms of narrative person, he is involved in the story as a character and, in Genette's terms, he is a homodiegetic element. Thus, Sammy (as a narrator) objectivises himself. This objectivisation gives rise to an important distinction: As far as the theme of the novel is concerned, it may seem to be the character's isolation from his own past and attempt to review it; but, in terms of narrative fiction, it is a distinction between the narrating agent and the object of narration. So, throughout the narrative, recurrent references to the narration of his own story differentiate Sammy-the-narrator from Sammy-the-character; and the act of narration by Sammy-the-narrator frames the experiences of Sammy-the-character. In fact, the implied author writes a character writing (narrating) and he also presents an exploration of the possibilities of first-person narration.[57] From the beginning of the novel, it is seen that the-I-narrator refers to himself as a character and in order to understand himself he underlines the importance of "communication," which in our context refers to narration:

> We are dumb and blind yet we must see and speak. Not the stubbled face of Sammy Mountjoy, the full lips that open to let his hand take out a fag, not the smooth, wet muscles inside round teeth, not the gullet, the lung, the heart −those you could see and touch if you took a knife to him on the table. It is the unnameable, unfathomable and invisible darkness that sits at the centre of him, always awake, always different from what you believe it to be, always thinking and feeling what you can never know it thinks and feels, that hopes hopelessly to understand and to be understood […] There is this hope. I may communicate in part; and that surely is better than utter blind and dumb […] I may find the indications of a pattern that will include me (*FF*, 7-9)

From the narrator's perspective, it is implied that the act of narration is a pattern that can help explore and express the human Sammy, who attempts to gain an insight through narration (communication) and takes a "symbolic journey into his own memory" (Dickson, 60). So, conceiving of the narrating agent as "establishing in words the constituents of a possible 'I'" (Redpath, 136) extends

the limits of the moral allegory in the novel[58] and invites the implied reader to get involved in the process. Redpath states that "the synthesizing of the constituents which form the 'I' of the texts takes place inside the reader" (136). The-I-narrator in *FF*, therefore, turns out to be an instrument to "create individual consciousnesses" (Redpath, 136). Besides, Sammy's narration presents the implied reader with the indicators of this process.[59] This is "concerned with the question of the freedom of the action" (Friedman, 68) and helps make the implied reader become conscious of his own 'I'. Redpath adds, "when Sammy writes 'I' we, as we read, echo that 'I'; our inner reading voice becomes a reflection of Sammy's written voice. Our own pronoun and his merge" (Redpath,137).

In *FF* the implied author employs a self-conscious 'I' narrator who produces a retrospective[60] narrative. The 'I' narrator's perception of his own work (narration) and life (story) is important in terms of narrative technique because it refers to a conscious act of narration and serves to reconstruct himself as a character from his new perspective. Dickson states that "clearly Sammy is more aware of himself and his loss of freedom than any of the characters in the previous fiction" (Dickson, 59).But it seems that Sammy is also aware of what he is doing and he emphasizes his status as a narrator: He says "I must go back and tell my story over. It is a curious story, not so much in the external events which are common enough, but in the way it presents itself to me, the only teller" (*FF*, 6). His initial remarks about his own narration are important here. He describes his story as "a curious story" (6), not from an outer perspective but from an inner perspective. He is ware of his status as a narrator: "the only teller." He locates himself as the sole narrating agent who is privileged to organise memories, "for time is not to be laid out endlessly like a row of bricks" (6). Thus, the "only teller" will oscillate between, in Sammy-the-narrator's terms, the "two modes of time" (6), that is, the past which the young and free Sammy experienced through his "effortless perception" (6) and the memories from the narrator's present perspective. It is seen that constant elaboration on his own narrating activity shows his awareness also as a storyteller:

> The mind cannot hold more than so much; but understanding requires a sweep that takes in the whole of remembered time and then can pause. Perhaps if I write my story as it appears to me, I shall be able to go back and select. Living is like nothing because it is everything –is too subtle and copious for unassisted thought. Painting is like a single attitude, a selected thing (*FF*, 7).

As the protagonist Sammy is a painter, he refers many times in the narrative to the act of painting, which turns into a metaphor standing for the act of narration (writing). Sammy-the-narrator, therefore, uses recollections to organize his narration just as he composes a painting on "a rectangle of a canvas" (7). He reorganizes his recollections like paintings, each one separated from the others by a frame. Such carefully organized echoes, interior monologues, thoughts and memories help him travel into his present self and his past, innocent and free life:

> I am the sum of them [memories]. I carry round with me this load of memories. Man is not an instantaneous creature, nothing but a physical body and the reaction of the moment. He is an incredible bundle of miscellaneous memories and feelings, of fossils and coral growths. I am not a man who was a boy looking at a tree. I am a man who remembers being a boy looking at a tree" (46).

The sketches and scenes conveyed through recollections make up short embedded narratives (narratives in the second degree) as well, and though the narrator remains the same, the narrator's point of view shifts with that of the character in different recollections. The scenes include, for instance, "he is stealing cards at school" (52) and "spitting on the church altar, manipulated by Philip (70). They are, as the narrator declares at the very beginning of the novel, "reorganized memories" (7) achieved through "going back" and "selecting" (7).

Johnson points to the fact that in *FF* there is a "characteristic use of stringently limited point of view" (Johnson, 71). Sammy-the-narrator, also as a focalizer, exploits all types of focalizations and *FF* is an example of "creating narrative consciousness" (Johnson, 68) as the narrator-protagonist attempts through his own narration to develop "a comprehensive view of the world" (Johnson, 71). Johnson states that "without a doubt, this type of literature places

considerable burdens on the implied reader who must, perhaps, interpret the narrative by an act of "passionate insight" (71). The narrator-focalizer in *FF* also implies that he will perceive his past life from a specific angle. He points out that "I write my story as it appears to me" and "I shall be able to go back and select" (7). Particularly, Rotten Row scenes are worthy of consideration because the striking difference between the perspectives is evident in these parts. The world of the narrator's earliest memories portrays a rural slum: poverty, hardship and dirt. In the scene quoted below, the act of focalization helps to reveal both perspectives simultaneously. The focalization of the Little Sammy (the character) is filtered (and interpreted) by the mind of the narrator-focalizer Sammy:

> (1) The scene is worth reconstructing.
> (2) Opposite each house across the brick alley with the gutter down the middle was a square of brick walls with an entry. (3) The walls were about three feet high. (4) In each square on the left hand side was a standpipe and beyond it, at the back of the square, was a centry-box closed by a wooden door which had a sort of wooden *grating*. (5) Open the door by lifting the wooden latch and you faced a wooden box running the whole width between the walls and pierced by a round, worn orifice. (6) There would be a scrap of newspaper lying on the box, or a whole sheet crumpled on the damp floor. (7) Some dark, subterranean stream flowed slowly along below the row of boxes. (8) If you closed the door and dropped the latch by means of a piece of string which dangled inside, you could enjoy your private, even in Rotten Row (*FF*, 19).

Here, in (1) the narrator-focalizer suggests that this is an act of remembering. In this sense, it seems possible to take it as an internal focalization from within (revealing the remembering mind in Genettean terminology). But on the other hand, the mind of Sammy-the-narrator is reconstructing a scene from little Sammy-the-character's perspective, and a focalizer, who is external to the frame of the narrative event, focalizes an internal agent (a focal character) who is focalizing. Thus, the implied reader perceives Rotten Row from little Sammy-the-character's perspective. Nevertheless, the sophisticated language of the narrator is indicative of adult Sammy-the-character's memory filtering the events, as well as

Sammy-the-narrator actually composing them as narrative. In the previous page of the narrative, the self-conscious narrator stated that "I should be false to my memories; for I first remember the alley as a world, bounded by the wooden gate at one end and the rectangular but forbidden exit to the main road at the other" (18). So, phrases such as "three feet" (3), "grating" (4), "orifice" (6), "a scrap of newspaper lying on the box" (7) "enjoy your private" (8) and "even" (8) indicate Sammy-the-narrator-focalizer's interpretation. The implied reader, for example, can infer that, from the little Sammy's perspective, the walls were higher than three feet, or privacy was not a primary concern.

Little Sammy-the-character's perspective is "lit with romance, beauty, mystery, [which] are quite as real as or more real than the realities they illuminate" (Kinkead-Weekes and Gregor, 171). His life in the muddy and "rotten" Rotten Row is punctuated with colourful and happy scenes as well. In such parts, it can be observed that there are immediate shifts in focalizations both from within and without. Sammy-the-narrator's reflection on his life makes him internal to the act of focalization but such moments are interwoven with external focalizations of little Sammy-the-character focalizing the objects:

> (1) What was the secret of the strange peace and security we felt? (2) Now if I invent I can see us from outside, (3) starry eyed ragamuffins, I with nothing but shirt and trousers, Johnny with not much more, wandering together through the gardens of the great house. (4) But I never saw us from outside. (5) To me, then, we remain these two points of perception, wandering in paradise. (6) I can only guess our innocence, not experience it. […] (7) Once, we came to a white path and found too late that it was new, unset concrete where we slid; (8) but we broke nothing else in the whole garden- we took nothing, almost we touched nothing. (9) We were eyes (45).

Here, in (1) his present thoughts are conveyed. In (3) as suggested by the self-conscious narrator-focalizer, there is a sense of external focalization from without (starry eyed children in shirt and trousers playing in the yard). The narrator-focalizer's mind perceives the children in this way. This perception is also part of an analeptic scene of his reminiscences. The ideas in (4) and (5) draw

our attention to little Sammy's childish unawareness and to his present state of mind. Now, he, as a narrator-focalizer, can see "from outside" how happy he was in a peaceful world like a paradise. In (6), (7) and (8) the narrator-focalizer focalizes the children focalizing, so there is an external focalization from within (indicators: white, concrete, slide, not touch). In (9) the idea of focalization is stressed because the scene was vividly portrayed through sense perceptions and reflected on the mind.

Sammy's progress toward self-knowledge is revealed through different perspectives and Sammy's interior monologues are of consideration in this context, which constitute internal focalizations. These are often inserted in the narration of a past event. The narrative level first shifts to the second degree, and then the first degree narrative level is reinstated:

> (1)
> Betrice was frightened. She gave me the lever I wanted.
> "I think I am mad, a bit–"
> (2)
> Once a human being has lost his freedom there is no end to the coils of cruelty. I must, I must, I must. They said the damned in hell were forced to torture the innocent live people with disease. But I know that life is perhaps more terrible than that innocent medieval misconception. We are forced here and now to torture each other. We can watch ourselves becoming automata, feel only terror as our alienated arms lift the instruments of their passion towards those we love […] My madness was Wagnerian. It drove me forth on dark nights, forsooth striding round the downs. I should have worn a cloak.
> (1)
> I sent a message in by the porter. Mr Mountjoy wishes to speak to Miss Ifor (115).

As for the question of reliability, Sammy-the-narrator is an unreliable narrating agent. He, as a first-person narrator, reveals and reflects the subjective aspects of his past experience. Johnson argues that *FF* is "spun from the mind of an unreliable narrator [and this] reveals that Golding is not a didactic fabulist" (Johnson, 71). In fact, the narrator stresses uncertainty, and frequently admits that he does not know what really happened and where he lost his freedom. He invites

the implied reader to accompany him in his search for the point where his fall began[61]. Really, Sammy-the-narrator seems to carry out a search for his identity and his past, and his abstaining from didacticism makes the moral allegory of the novel more powerful. Sammy admits that he does not know what really happened in the past, where and when he lost his freedom. As a self-conscious-narrator, he addresses the implied reader: "Do I exasperate you by translating incoherence into incoherence?" (8)" and then he states that "There is this hope. I may communicate in part; and that surely is better than utter blind and dumb; and I may find something like a hat to wear of my own" (9). He knows only "in part" and cannot remember everything as it was. So, with his limited knowledge, Sammy-the-narrator attempts to translate incoherence but he knows that he cannot achieve full coherence. He remarks: "[The point here is] Not that I aspire to complete coherence" (9).

Sammy's personal involvement in the story as a first-person narrator by definition makes his narration unreliable (Rimmon-Kenan, 2002: 100) and the truth value of the narration must remain questionable. In this sense, however, unreliability is just a technical term and marks a narrative strategy. Sammy-the-narrator seems to be given the task of commentary, but in the form of interior monologues, which is among the signs of unreliability and has much to do with Genette's "emotive" function in the sense that the narrator is involved in a moral stance (Genette, 256-258). This function, for example, appears in Sammy's emotive gestures and remarks about his own perception of masculinity and femininity:

> Self looking in the mirror. I saw myself as a very ugly creature. The face that looked at mine was always solemn and shadowed […] The black hair, the wiry black eyebrows were not luxuriant but coarse. The features set themselves sternly as I strove to draw them and find out what I really was. The ears stood out, the forehead and the jaw receded. I felt myself to be anthropoid and tough, in appearance, no lady's man but masculine. But I would like to be a girl. This was in the fantasy world where their skirts and hair, their soft faces and the neatness of their bellies had always been […] I wanted to be one of them

> and thought this unique as self-abuse and very shameful.
> But I was mistaken all round. Masturbation is universal.
> Our sex is always uncertain (218-219).

Here, the signs of unreliability, as suggested above, are also the elements that differentiate the narrative from a didactic discourse and help to reflect the character's mindset infected with his sense of guilt (his sexual exploitation of Beatrice) and associated with female beauty and male "toughness."

As seen in the previous novels, there is a coda to this novel as well, the cell experience. It is embedded in the framing narrative as a chapter (Chp. 9, 166-185). After relating Sammy-the-character's terrors while locked in what he believes to be a Nazi prison cell, the implied reader later understands that the cell was in fact a broom closet and, more than that, a mere representation of Sammy-the-character's distressed and anxious mind. This is a solid sign of the unreliability of the narrator. The implied reader can never be sure whether the scenes narrated reflect some sort of objective reality or comprise merely the inventions of the protagonist narrator's mind. The narrator-focalizer, therefore, regards his act of narration as "the translation of the incoherence into incoherence" (8). His life, personality and unreliable narration creates an idea of incoherence, and he invites the implied reader to get involved in his act of "translation," in his search through narration.

FF may appear to be not "a true novel" but "a montage of situations" (Monod, 134) with its loosely connected, irregularly organised thirteen chapters and coda, and what Sammy-the-narrator calls incoherence can be overcome only by carrying out an attentive reading. Distorted temporal linearity and chronology is one of the primary characteristics of *FF*. As suggested many times in the narrative itself, the flashback technique and the deliberate distortion of the linearity of time, help illustrate (or translate, in Sammy-the-narrator's terms) the incoherence of life and human nature. The novel, therefore, "begins with a poetic collection of fragmented images" (Dickson, 60). Frank Kermode, therefore, argues that in *FF* "there is a relation which you might call contrapuntal [combining of two different melodies]- it is certainly mystifying" (130). It is a

narrative aiming at the reflection of a world in which "all patterns have broken one after another" (*FF*, 25). As Dickson notes, the narrative is "a collage of impressions, images, and memories –creating, at times, an almost surrealistic effect" (Dickson, 60). As suggested earlier, this not only brings about a distortion of temporal linearity (see also Monod, 137, 138) but also creates different narrative levels, which is "crucial to a full interpretation of *FF*" (Johnson, 71). It is seen that the implied author attempts to construct a "remembering I" that breaks the linearity in time:

> Then why am I writing this down? Why I do not walk round and round the lawn, reorganizing my memories until they make sense, unravelling and knitting up the flexible time stream? I could bring this and that event together, I could make leaps. I should find a system for that round of the lawn and then another one the next day. But thinking round and round the lawn is no longer enough. For one thing it is like the rectangle of canvas, a limited area however ingeniously you paint (7).

The purpose behind the "shuffling of time" (Monod, 137) and memories, as already stated, is closely related to the fact that this novel is an "investigative narrative," (Friedman, 68) and is also an exploration of "the possibility of resolving an issue through time" (Gindin, 46). The novel therefore can be characterized by the distorted chronological sequence in the narrative and this should be conceived as related to Sammy's persistent attempt to "locate his sin in time" (Gindin, 47). To achieve this, Sammy-the-narrator takes into consideration "two ways of perceiving reality" (Johnson, 66) and he prefaces his story by commenting that

> time is two modes. The one is an effortless perception native to us as water to the mackerel. The other is a memory, a sense of shuffle fold and coil, of that day nearer than that because more important, of that event mirroring this, or those three set apart, exceptional and out of the straight line altogether" (6).

This sense of two modes of perception brings about a "carefully structured narrative" (Johnson, 66) and the narrator-focalizer "jumps erratically between past and future" (Johnson, 67). Sammy-the-narrator, therefore, states that "the straight line from the first hiccup to the last gasp is a dead thing. For time is not to be laid out endlessly like a row of bricks" (*FF*, 6) Regarding *FF*'s attitude towards time and its psychological and moral associations, Monod argues that

> the technique has some traditional weight and significance. In fact the resulting time pattern is both psychologically and morally convincing: Psychologically, because as far as we know, the human mind is much less methodical than any form of printed narrative; memory never yields a continuously chronological sequence of events. That is a significant distinction between memories and memoires […] Morally the quest for guilt and responsibility is much assisted by the potentialities of such a time pattern." (Monod, 139)

The constant and recurrent time shifting of Sammy-the-narrator's mind on the textual level is indicative of a nonlinear time structure and cannot be restricted to any single chapter in the narrative. However, on the story level, which is cast in a relatively rational mode, Sammy-the-character's story follows a linear path from chapter one to chapter nine, comprising various recollections of past events: Rotten Row, youthful friendship with Johnny and Philip, adolescence guardianship by Father Watts Watt, pursuit and betrayal of Beatrice, marriage to Taffy, prisoner-of-war experience and interrogation by Halde, subsequent imprisonment in the dark closet. When locked up in a dark room the structure of the narrative gets slightly more complicated because at this level of narration, it is possible to find a connection between Sammy-the-character's terrors and his childhood experience of darkness. At the end of chapter nine, a new "shuffle fold and coil narrative" is anticipated. Sammy-the-character's mind, fraught with the terror of darkness, is "struck with full force backward into time past … [it] turned therefore and lunged, uncoiled, struck at the future … and burst that door" (185). As for chapters ten to fourteen, they are altogether apparently out of the linear progress of the narration because they "represent one expanded moment of time"

(Johnson, 67). What is seen is the "visionary flashes of a future he has yet to live" (67).

Chapters ten to fourteen deal with a fractured structure and in these chapters the implied author's hand is more obvious. Therefore, Sammy-the-narrator, attempts to find an appropriate instrument, not a mere pattern, to reveal his past experience, or if we have to call it a pattern, it should be a flexible one with a complex and distorted chronology. This peculiar structuring of a time-scale should be consistent, as Tiger notes of *FF*, with the fact that Sammy Mountjoy [the narrator] seeks desperately to find a pattern not to impose it." (Tiger, *The Dark Field of Discovery*) As the mind and memory of Sammy-the-narrator may distort, erase, or even invent, writing/storytelling is concerned with controlling the time or setting it free. Redpath argues that, "the text Sammy writes, like Freud's 'Mystic Writing Pad,' is a supplement to memory (128)" Kinkead Weekes-Gregor claims that "the peculiar chronology of *FF* is not wilfully obscure, but logical" (172) since memory is inclined to shuffle the events. As suggested earlier, the novel begins with Sammy-the-narrator's elaboration on his own act of storytelling and illustrates his present confusion about his past. His narration turns into a remembering act. The framing narrative in the first degree, which is concerned with the present mind of Sammy-the-narrator and the past memories of Sammy-the-character, also breaks the chronology of the reminiscences. This is particularly of interest in the last chapters:

> The last chapters have their own rationale. If taken as an expression of the spiritual mode of perceiving reality, their leaps into past and future melt into one comprehensive moment of experience which is juxtaposed against Sammy's prior rational attempt in the earlier chapters to discover the one moment in time where he has lost his freedom" (Johnson, 67)

For example, in Chapter 7 the implied reader sees Sammy in the interrogation hall, and then level of narration changes and from Sammy's distorted vision, his hallucinations are conveyed. The opacity reaches its maximum in the following two chapters (Chps. 8-9) because in this section the perceiving mind goes on

travelling around the past blurred with hallucinations. In this dreamlike experience he remembers many things, Rotten Row days again, or school days where his fear of darkness started because of the boarding school conditions. Also Sammy-the-character's subconscious becomes transparent through this narration. Towards the end of chapter 9 Sammy-the narrator implies the delusionary status of what he has already told. He remembers how panicked he was in the dark. It is also implied that the duration of the narration is longer than that of the experience and this means that the narration is a little bit decelerated through the two chapters:

> Help me! Help me!
>
> Let me be accurate now if ever. These pages I have written have taught me much; not least that no man can tell the whole truth, language is clumsier in my hands than paint. And yet my life has remained centred round the fact of the next few minutes I spent alone and panic-stricken in the dark. My cry for help was the cry of the rat when the terrier shakes it, a hopeless sound, the row signature of one savage act. My cry meant no more, was instinctive, said here is flesh of which the nature is to suffer and do thus.I cried out not with hope of an ear but as accepting a shut door, darkness and a shut sky (184).

After this experience, in Chapter 10 Sammy is released from the camp and the book's chronology is broken again in the following chapters where the narration returns to school days. In these parts Sammy-the-narrator is sometimes back to the narrative present, rethinking the past events. The broken linearity of the temporal flow helps the attentive reader to recognise the connection "between the little boy clear as spring water, and the man like stagnant pool" (9). Two contrasting views of life[62] are therefore presented through the possibilities of the act of narration. It is seen that Sammy-the-character's search through narration gets closer to its aim towards the end of this chapter:

> What is important to you?
> "Beatrice Ifor."
> She thinks you depraved already. She dislikes you.
> "If I want something enough I can always get it provided I am willing to make the appropriate sacrifice."

> What will you sacrifice?
> "Everything."
>
> Here? (236)

In this scene (in Sammy's promise to sacrifice everything) Sammy-the-narrator and the implied reader can now better understand the "cry of the rat". This scene is analeptic both to the time of the framing narrative and to the time of the cell experience (given earlier in the narrative). Sammy-the-narrator asks "here?" It seems that this is the point/moment that he has been looking for. The implied reader, then, would see the result of this decisiveness in Chapter 13, that illustrates Sammy's visit to the hospital. The fragments of his affair with Beatrice are scattered in Chapters 4,5,6,12,13.

5.2. Reconstructing the Character

The technique of *FF* relies on the first person narrator's "remembered image of oneself" (Monod, 136). This image is created through pictures. Sammy-the-narrator says understanding "must include pictures from those early days" (9). He also states that "I am trying to fasten myself on the white paper (10). Therefore, in *FF* "concentration is centred on the creation of a self" (124). Sammy-the-narrator invites the implied reader to search for how, why and when the totally free Sammy with a power to choose made a decision that led to the loss of freedom and choice. Monod states that he "conducts a search and self-examination" (Monod, 137) and Boyd describes the novel as an "exploration of the darkness at the centre of us" (Boyd, 81). As the self is lost in darkness, Sammy-the-narrator aims to construct a centre and structure an "I", and the central preoccupation of *FF* is "what this 'I' really is" (Redpath, 124, 127). Sammy-the-narrator remarks

> the unnameable, unfathomable, and invisible darkness that sits at the centre of him … always different from what you think it to be, always thinking and feeling what you can never know it thinks and feels (8).

The implied reader is involved in this constructing and structuring process; as Redpath claims: "the [implied] reader becomes the second protagonist" (124). Sammy-the-narrator's act of writing aims to portray Sammy-the-character also as if he was a different person rereading his story like a reader:

> I have no responsibility for some of the pictures. I can remember myself as I was when I was a child. But even if I had committed murder then I should no longer feel responsible for it. There is a threshold here, too, beyond which what we did was done by someone else" (9).

His loss of free will is considered "the beginning of the process of acting out the representations of the determined being" (Gindin, 43). Sammy-the-narrator claims that he has no responsibility for the past, and suggests that he has dealt with the past only because he needs to understand it. According to Gindin, Golding refers to theological issues in this novel and "Sammy can be held responsible for his actions, can be judged for abandoning freedom" (43). Thus, the experienced Sammy, the narrator, presents the implied reader with a mind in progress, which tries to create a complicated pattern (a narrative discourse, though shuffled) to express the patternlessness of life. Sammy-the-narrator presents himself as being in the middle of a process of reviewing his own story, which makes him reconstruct himself through the act of narration. Since the novel aims to reveal "the natural chaos of existence" (Friedman, 68), the implied reader and Sammy-the-narrator try to discover whether Sammy has a capacity for both selfishness/rationalism and selflessness/spirituality. The narrative technique is complicated to enable the implied reader to bear witness to Sammy-the-character's fall and Sammy-the-narrator's attempted redemption. After starting his narration, Sammy says "now if I invent I can see us from outside" (45).[63]

His narrative is a narrative of self discovery and he attempts to clear the opacity in his life. His childhood, for example, without having a father is an opacity in his life, which he does not even bother about. He says "I never knew my father and I think my mother never knew him either. I cannot be sure, of course, but I incline to believe she never knew him […] Half my immediate ancestry is so inscrutable that I seldom find it worth bothering about. I exist" (9).

He exists and now it is time to reconstruct his self with a capacity for experiencing both spiritual and rational aspects of life. Sammy-the-narrator thinks that the scenes he remembers have an importance in his personal history. He, in due course, understands that "these pictures are not altogether random" (*FF*, 46). They come to his mind without chronology and Sammy-the-narrator admits that they do not constitute a straight line in his story but he nevertheless "describe(s) them because they seem to be important." (*FF*, 46).

Sammy-the-narrator selects such important scenes from his past and carries out his search. For example, he remembers a scene from his childhood days in Rotten Row which gives him pain. He says it was "a day aflame and unbearable without drama and adventure. Something must happen" (*FF*, 20). The implied reader perceives the scene through the mind of Sammy-the-narrator. The scene is both externally and internally focalized through the eyes of the character. Here a significant change in the tense is also indicative of a shift in focalization:

> (1) I was playing with a matchbox in the gutter. (2) I was so small that to squat was natural but the wind even in the alley would sometimes give me a sidelong push and I was as much in the soapy water as out. (3) A grate was blocked so that the water spread across the bricks and made a convenient ocean. (4) Yet, my great, my apocalyptic memory is not of stretched-out time, but an instant. (5) Mrs. Donavan's Maggie who smelt so sweet and showed round, silk knees was recoiled from the entrance to our brick square. (6) She had retreated so fast and so far that one high heel was in my ocean […] (7) I cannot remember her face − for it is mesmerized in the other direction. (8) Poor Mrs. Donovan, the dear withered creature, peeps out of her own bog with the air of someone unfairly caught, someone who could explain everything, given time −but knows, in that tremendous instant, that time is not given to her. (9) And from our bog, our own, private bog, with its warm, personal seat, comes my ma. […] (10) My ma faces Maggie [whose] knees are bent, she is crouched, in a position of dreadful menace. (11) Her skirts are huddled up round her waist and she holds her vast grey bloomers in two purple hands just above her knees. (12) I see her voice, a jagged shape of scarlet and bronze, shatter into the air till it hangs there under the sky, a deed of conquest and

> terror. “You bloody whore! Keep your clap for your own bastards!” (*FF*, 21)

In (1) and (2) the scene is focalized by the narrator-focalizer from without. In (3) focalization shifts to the children’s perception. There is an indication of the infant perception: “ocean”. The infant Samuel was so small that he calls a pool an ocean. There is a sense of infant naivety. In (4) the level of focalization shifts: The narrator-focalizer focalizes on his own mind (internal focalization from within). He thinks he cannot remember all the details, but an embarrassing scene of rejection. It was just an instant. There is also a reference to the remembered time, which reminds the implied author that he can remember such instants, moments of pains and pleasures. In (5) and (6) the previous level of focalization in (3) is reinstated and the scene is revealed from without. In (7) it is implied that Sammy-the-narrator is also viewing the scene along with the implied reader. The word “direction” suggests that he does not imagine or invent anything but just tries to remember. From little Sammy-the-character’s angle of vision, that is, from his perspective, the face cannot be seen. In (8) focalization shifts to the eyes of little Sammy-the-character and from this point on his perspective orients the narration. This time Sammy, the narrator-focalizer, focalizes little Sammy-the-character while focalizing the events. Also indicative is the change in the tense from the past to the present. In (8) the voice and ironic tone belong to Sammy-the-narrator. In (12) from little Sammy-the-character’s perspective, it is claimed that Mrs. Donovan’s “voice” shatters the air, having a tremendous effect on the infant.[64]

Such “tremendous instants” from his schooldays help to reconstruct his character. Another striking moment of the history of the little Sammy is his “touch” with religion. Sammy-the-narrator, from a child’s perspective, remembers an unforgettable lesson given by Miss Massey, a thin grey haired-woman in control of everything in the infant school, in a fine afternoon with piles of “white clouds” and “blue sky” outside the window. He remembers a moth “among the clouds, climbing, looping, spinning and threading the high valleys” (*FF*, 55). In his search through the past, Sammy-the-narrator finds out what puzzled, and injured, a child’s memory:

> How had religion touched us so far?
> […]
> Johnny was up there, too. He was flying. I knew what was going to happen and I made cautious attempts to warn him […] Johnny's hands were behind his back, his chin on his chest.
> "Look at me when I speak to you."
> The chin lifted, ever so slightly.
> "Why did I tell you those three stories?"
> We could just here his muttered answer. The moth had flown away.
> "Idonnomiss."
> Miss Massey hit him on both sides of the head, precisely with either hand, a word and a blow.
> "God–"
> Smack!
> "–is–"
> Smack!
> "–love–"
> Smack! Smack! Smack!
> You knew where you were with Miss Massey.
> So religion, if disorganized, had entered our several lives. I think Johhny and I accepted it as an inevitable part of an enigmatic situation which was quite beyond our control (56).

In this scene, like Mrs. Donovan's "visible voice", those "smacks" are unforgettable. They have a remarkable role in understanding what the "touch" of religion means to little Sammy-the-character. The irony arises with the very beginning of the scene when Sammy-the-narrator mentions "touch." The implied reader, from the child's perspective again, hears the smacking sounds of this touch. This time, the beauty of the scene, with the blue sky outside and the flying moth is interrupted by that sound. At the end of the scene narrative level changes and level of focalization is reinstated. Sammy-the-narrator has therefore found one more piece of the jigsaw puzzle. In his small and innocent world (he calls it his "island") religion means terror. He perceives through the childish mind, "a remote noise," "a light, a wooden box, white cloaks hanging up, and a brass cross" (62). These objects of focalization also remind him of a church: "This world of terror and lightning was only a church being prepared for an evening service" (62).

Dickson states that in *FF* the process of becoming and the moment of self-discovery are closely related (58). This is because Sammy-the-narrator's self-conscious narration, instead of focusing on the nature (being) of the character, as in *PM*, "concentrates on how a similar character came to reveal his sinful nature on the process of becoming" (Gindin, 43). However, it seems that Sammy-the-narrator focuses clearly on himself as a storyteller. This suggests a certain transformation of the painter-creator to the writer-creator as suggested earlier: "I tick [I type]. I exist" (*FF*, 10). This echoes the Cartesian motto "I think, therefore I am". So, the implied reader views Sammy-the-narrator at the stage of becoming while participating in Sammy-the-character's sinful and deteriorated being. At the end of chapter 3, he acquits infant Sammy. He says "the smell [of guilt] either inevitable or chosen came later" (78). The point where he lost his freedom must be somewhere else.

> That must be the end of a section. There is no root of infection to be discovered in those picture. The smell of today, the grey faces that look over my shoulder have nothing to do with the infant Samuel. I acquit him. He is some other person in some other country to whom I have this objective and ghostly access (78).

Considering the positioning of the narrator and the character, it can be argued that Sammy-the- narrator is concerned with the process of becoming (search), and Sammy-the-character, is concerned with being (human being infected with guilt). The choice of manipulation of time in *FF*, therefore, should be considered in this context, as Dickson points out: "the flashback technique [of *PM*] is concerned with the process of Becoming as well as the state of Being" (Dickson, 58). The investigation of a crucial change in Sammy's identity and his loss of freedom requires a constant shift between the present and the past, and if we approach the issue on a structural level, "the thematic dualism, the rational and spiritual modes of perception, exists simultaneously within the consciousness [of the characters], and by inference- [within the consciousness of] the reader" (Johnson, 66). So, the question is not only "when and where he lost his freedom" but also "when he became the 'I' capable of writing the text we read" (66).

Sammy-the-narrator, in carrying out a journey into his own past, projects light on "Sammy". He states "I am not he [Sammy-the-character]. I am a man who goes at will to that show of shadows, sits in judgement as over a strange being. I look for the point where this monstrous world of my present consciousness began (78).

The character's "level of awareness" is an important point to elaborate because Sammy, in terms of awareness of him, has a unique place among other Golding characters. "Sammy-the-narrator is more aware of his loss of freedom than any of the characters in the previous fiction" (Dickson, 59). Golding stresses the importance of "putting [a character] in a position where he understands some kind of process −it may be emotionally understanding, not intellectually understanding" (Biles, ed., 66). So, it is seen that Sammy-the-character and Sammy-the-narrator are put in different positions in terms of handling the story. The protagonist narrator seems "constantly [to] examine moral questions [and to] locate which action can be judged and which cannot, so that the novel radiates a much more severe sense of moral judgement" (Gindin, 43).

FF presents the implied reader with new dimensions of characterization, which in some ways manifests a sense of irony. It is particularly obvious in Sammy's remark that "people are the walls of our room, not philosophies" (*FF*, 7) because it is social relationships and people not their ideas that shape the character's personality. The dichotomy between Nick Shales and Miss Pringle, the representatives of the two opposing views, is worthy of consideration at this point. Sammy-the-narrator believes that "my child's (Sammy-the-character) mind was made up for me as a choice between good and wicked fairies" (217). Sammy-the-narrator now understands that the self is "a portion" of both. The narrator's mind again works upon solid images created in the stories of Miss Pringle, preoccupied with Moses, against the physical world of Nick Shales:

> The one I inhabited by nature, the world of miracle drew me strongly. To give up the burning bush, the water from the rock, the spittle on the eyes was to give up a portion of myself, a dark and inward and fruitful portion. Yet looking at me from the bush was the fat and freckled face of Miss Pringle. The other world, the

> cool and reasonable was home to the friendly face of Nick Shales. I do not believe that rational choice stood any chance of exercise. I believe that my child's mind was made up for me as a choice between good and wicked fairies. Miss Pringle vitiated her teaching. She failed to convince, not by what she said but by what she was. Nick persuaded me to his natural scientific universe by what he was, not by what he said (217).

Although there is no place for spirit in Nick Shale's scientific method (*FF*, 226), his affection for people and his genuine compassion attract Sammy. Miss Pringle's "cruelty, prudery, and aloofness turn Sammy against religion, even though he initially is more attracted to spiritualism than to Nick's rationalism" (Dickson, 67). Sammy-the-narrator now thinks that "the beauty of Miss Pringle's cosmos was vitiated because she was a bitch. Nick's stunted universe was irradiated by his love of people" (226). Their difference is obvious, for example, in their supposed reaction to Sammy's love for Beatrice. Upon falling in love with Beatrice, Sammy tries to draw a new portrait of Beatrice (because the previous one was hastily and carelessly drawn but the result was very good, and given to Philip, his close friend) but he cannot "catch the being of Beatrice on paper" no matter how much effort he puts into his work. Sammy-the-narrator remembers creating a fantasy world in his mind:

> In my fantasy world the dreams were generous enough. I wanted to rescue her [Beatrice] from something violent. She was lost in a forest and I found her. We slept in a hollow tree, she in my arms, close, her face on my shoulder. And there was the light round her brow of paradise.
> Let us see if the outcome could have been different. To whom could I have gone and spoken of this? Nick would have dismissed that light. Miss Pringle would have had me expelled as a danger to her dim girls" (*FF*, 223-224).

Except for the childhood, the recollections of Sammy-the-narrator present Sammy-the-character as a physically and psychologically abusing person who makes Sammy-the-narrator feel guilty and be "haunted by the memory of his sins" (Boyd, 63). Sammy's great weakness leading him to commit a sin is his sexual

desires (a rational and reasonable instinct in Nick's terms), which in time have a grip over his whole personality.[65] Sammy-the-narrator recognises the fact that "sex thrust [him] strongly to choose and know" (226). Therefore, it is possible to read the novel as "a study of sexual desire as part of the complex nexus of emotions" (Boyd, 64). This can be seen in Sammy-the-character's obsession with Beatrice Ifor[66] and in her name's reference to Dante's *La Vita Nouva*, which implies a world gone for ever. Dante's world is a world in which "human love seems conducive to nobility and dignity" (Boyd, 65). Boyd states that in *La Vita Nouva*, "the whole universe is an expression, a manifestation of [God's] love, a love made flesh. [This is] Dante's indubitably idealised human love" (Boyd, 66) "A very different universe from the modern one Sammy lives and suffers in" because "for the most part, love in *FF* partakes of the qualities of the modern world: it is dirty, cruel and violent" (Boyd, 66). Sammy-the-narrator remembers Sammy as a young man sometimes speaking like a poet. In such reminiscences, he is seen to use a dignified and lyric language of beauty to describe his love. For example, he wishes to tell Beatrice how "he burns, how there are flames shooting out of his head and heart" or that "she was so sweet, so unique, so beautiful" (*FF*, 93); however, he soon hesitates: "or did I invent her beauty?" (*FF*, 93). His actions, particularly his abuse and betrayal of Beatrice show an "absolute lack of sentimentality" and "Sammy's recollections of love fill [the implied reader] with [prospective] 'horror'" (Boyd, 64). His love is mixed with desire and "the ordinary" girl turns into a mystery for the young man.

> (1) I put my arm round her and vibrated, but she never noticed. […] I bent and put my cheek against hers. I was looking where she looked.
> "Beatrice."
> "Mm?"
> "What is it like to be you?"
> (2) A sensible question; and asked out of my admiration […] out of my painful obsession with discovery and identification. An impossible question.
> "Just ordinary."
> (3) What is it like to hold the centre of someone's universe, to be soft and fair and sweet, to be neat and clean by nature, to be desired to distraction, to live under this

> hair, behind these huge, unutterable eyes, to feel the lift of these guarded twins, the valley, the plunge down to the tiny waist, to be vulnerable and invulnerable […]; what is it like to know your body breathes this faint perfume which makes my heart burst and my senses swim?
> "No. Tell me."
> (4) And can you feel them all the way out to the rounded points? […] Above all else, even beyond the musky treasures of your white body, this body is so close to me and unattainable, above all else: What is your mystery? (103-104)

In this flashback, Sammy-the-character is focalized from within. His interior monologue in (3) and (4) shows that he is obsessed not only with the pure spiritual beauty of Beatrice, but also with her physical charm. This scene portrays the clash between the spiritual and the physical and Sammy recognises this. Beatrice, therefore, looks like an unbelievable unity of both, and "what is it like to be Beatrice?" sounds like an impossible question. For the inexperienced Sammy, this creates a mystery. For this reason, Sammy-the-narrator states that "this young man [was] wild and ignorant, asking for help and refusing it, proud, loving, passionate and obsessed: How can I blame him for his actions since clearly at that time he was beyond the taste or the hope of freedom?" (*FF*, 103) However, to come up with and recognise this reality, he will have to wait until he has confronted the darkness in him. So, his experience as prisoner-of-war triggers a dramatic and spiritual change in his personality. He faces himself and the events that lead to his depravity with Beatrice, who cannot find a secure place in his dark centre, and comes across self-hatred, not hatred of Beatrice. It is highly suggestive that after Sammy has returned from the war, he visits Beatrice in hospital and this "reflects his increasing progress toward self knowledge" (Dickson, 66). It can be inferred that Sammy's hospital visit is a clear attempt at compassion and with this scene the narrative structure becomes circular (like in *IN*) drawing out the narrator's returning to the point where the novel can be retold. Dickson states that "he recognizes the harmful results of his "experiment" in egotism" (Dickson, 68). Eventually Sammy-the-narrator and the implied reader bear witness to the recognition of the real 'I' in the mirror of narration:

> Self looking in the mirror. I saw myself as an ugly creature. The face that looked at mine was always solemn and shadowed. The black hair, the wiry black eyebrows were not luxuriant but coarse. The features set themselves sternly as I strove to draw them and find out what I really was (218-19).

The experience of darkness conveyed through different levels of focalization (focalizations from within) constitute important narrative parts in the novel, the presence of which is consonant with the choice of a flexible time concept elaborated by the narrative technique. Sammy's question "How did I come to be so frightened of the dark?" (*FF*, 137) opens up a new aspect of Sammy-the-character. It is implied that Sammy-the-narrator is ready to face that experience, and explores the darkness and its influences on his personality. The implied author's hand, however, will be clear in the last chapter, in which the implied reader learns that the experience of darkness told in chapters nine and ten are just the inventions of the mind. The terror of the cell (in reality a broom closet) proves to have been fully made up by Sammy's own imagination and qualms. These are the moments of extreme self centeredness. In these moments, he is confronted with his subconscious. He has again many pictures flowing through the mind. A number of images like "blind folded eyes," "held down trouser," "door," "walls," "darkness." "frozen foetus," "curling, crawling snake" (166-177) reveal his "automatic fear" (178). In fact, this was the picture of "absolute helplessness" (184) and portrayed the physical/rational entity ("the ant-lion", "the snake" or "the rat"; FF, 170, 177, 184) as instinctively crying for help. He states "but there was no help in the concrete of the cell" (184). Sammy-the-narrator, uses this scene as an allegory for imprisonment of the self (controlled by instincts) within the purely rational realm of Dr. Halde and Nick Shales. At the beginning of this part, Sammy-the-narrator states that his "pictures of torment were unformed" and "somewhere there was a bench in my mind […]; Nick Shales stood behind that bench and demonstrated the relativity of sense impressions" (166). Now, he understands that Sammy-the-character was entrapped by the physical world. He understands that "in the physical world there was neither help nor hope of weakness that might be attacked and overcome" (185). In light of this,

if the attentive reader remembers Sammy-the-character saying that "I gaped with blindness. The first step was an absence of light, light taken from the visual artist" (174), then Sammy-the-narrator is enlightened with the power of insight and as a writer/artist has a capacity for recreation of these pictures of the snake or the rat: "there was no escape from the place, and the snake, the rat, struck again from the place away from now into time" (185). Sammy-the-narrator suggests that Sammy-the-character is full of the unknown, "the "unfathomable and invisible darkness" inside (*FF*, 8). In the dark centre sitting inside him (the narrative initially claims that Sammy-the-character sits in it), Sammy-the-narrator focalizes and discovers the central darkness of his self, and the human self, this fictitious and imaginary "external darkness mirrors inner darkness" (Redpath, 133). The narrator states that "when the eyes of Sammy were turned in on myself with … stripped and dead objectivity, what they saw was not beautiful but fearsome" (FF, 190) Isolation in the cupboard/cell, therefore, can be an opportunity to embrace the spiritual world.

5.3. Colours and Perceptions: Vivid Imagery

FF presents a story with a relatively contemporary setting. It includes a number of realistic episodes enriched and coloured by the imagination of the artist (artist as Sammy-the writer [speak-narration] and as Sammy-the painter [see-focalization]). That the protagonist of the story is a painter who conceives of life as a painting is a direct reference to the fact that the implied author "imagines a painter visualizing a painting" (Biles ed., 53), in which his imagination appears to be strong enough to develop sensitivity towards sense perceptions. Particularly in the portrayal of Sammy's early life, "a powerful element of creative imagination" (Monod, 144, footprint, 22) is, therefore, symptomatic:

> Outside the window the long winter road would darken. A sky-sign would become visible, a square of red words with a yellow line chasing round them; a whole mile of street lights would start and quiver into dull yellow as though they suddenly awoke (*FF*, 112)

So, the two painters (the narrator and the character) of the story attempt to draw "pictures in his mind" (*FF*, 18) from the past, which are, in Sammy-the-narrator's terms, "worth reconstructing" (19). It is seen that Sammy the narrator frequently refers to the act of painting/drawing a picture as well as the act of writing/narrating/remembering. He conceives of himself "as well as on canvas" (103). Gindin states that "Sammy both thinks and imagines in 'pictures,' in graphic representations of what he is" and "develops his skill with his 'pictures'" (45). According to Golding, Sammy's "pictures from those early days" (*FF*, 9) or "pictures in the mind" (*FF*, 18) are "recognizable" to the contemporary generation (Biles, ed. 79). Sammy-the-narrator's memory "hangs the events in their symbolic colours" (*FF*, 28). He remembers, for example, [the infant Samuel] "crawled and tumbled in the narrow world of rotten row, empty as a soap bubble but with a rainbow colour and excitement round me" (17). He perceives Rotten Row "in matchments of black and violet and purple" and "with the enjoyment of booze and sorrow" (*FF*, 28). Or, the implied reader can find various "dirty," "muddy" or "grimy" sketches from the English slum. As the vivid images that Sammy-the-narrator selects are the pictures of his own past, according to Dickson, these "vivid images" help "concretize experience" (Dickson, 72). This concretization can be in different directions because "the muddy pictures" create a contrast with Sammy's pure and free childhood as fresh as spring water; whereas the war motif and dark pictures from the experience of war make up an appropriate background for the inner chaos and central darkness in human nature.

The fact that Sammy-the-narrator throughout the narrative tries to project various pictures and scenes, provides the implied reader also with examples of focalizations (from within), which are being produced by the details of sense perceptions. These scenes obviously remind the implied reader of captured scenes from a movie:

> (1) [Ma] is the warm darkness between me and the cold light. (2) She is the end of the tunnel, she. (3) And now something happens in my head. (4) Let me catch the picture before the perception vanishes. (5) Ma spreads as I remember her, (6) she blots out

> the room and the house, (7) her wide belly expands, she is seated in her certainty and indifference more firmly than in a throne (*FF*, 15).

Here in (1) the implied reader permeates the present mind. It is seen that Sammy's artistic sensitivity to perceptions is reflected. The verbal indicators such as "warm," "darkness," "cold" and "light" invites the implied reader to the visual world of Sammy. In (2) the mind of the artist/narrator is to be obsessed with the light again: "the end of the tunnel," that is, the light. In (3), (4) and (5) Sammy-the-narrator turns into an observer like the implied reader: Ma is painted on the mind. In (6) and (7) Ma is focalized from without by Sammy. Dickson argues that "the effect" of such scenes "is similar to freeze-framing a portion of moving film" (70). The implied reader is, therefore, invited to catch a movie and presented with scenes and pictures from the character's perspective, where the character turns into a focalizer and he himself focalizes the things from within. The voice being heard belongs to the narrator but the implied reader sees through the eyes of Sammy-the-character. It is seen that, as Dickson states, "he does not hesitate, however, to adjust his image in order to capture [the] essence" (70) and the mother scene goes on with other reminiscences coloured with sense perceptions:

> (1) I can remember her only in clay, the common earth, the ground; (2) I cannot stick the slick commercial colours on stretched canvas for her or outline her in words that are ten thousand years younger than her darkness and warmth […] (3) That was Ma existing mutely in the middle. (4) I fish up memory of a piece of material which is grey with a tinge of yellow. (5) The one corner is frayed – or as I now think rotted into a fringe, a damp fringe (*FF*, 16).

It is seen that "clay" (1), "slick colours," "canvas," the repetitive "darkness and warmth" (2), "mutely" (silence) (3), "grey" and "a tinge of yellow" (4) and "damp" (5) are indicative of sense perceptions. As suggested earlier, the novel exhibits a "good and trained colour sense" (Dickson, 17). Sammy-the-narrator suggests his feelings "are represented by colours" (*FF*, 70). In many pictures he remembers the objects with coloured details. For example, he remembers himself

hurrying to prepare for a date with Beatrice in "grey shirt unbuttoned," "a blue jacket" and wearing "a red tie" (*FF*, 101-102). The April day described through the eyes of the painter, Sammy-the-character, is another remarkable example in this context. Here the painter uses strong and striking imagery, through which the implied author also proves to be a painter of words. Here Sammy-the-narrator's poetic skills and Sammy-the-focalizer's sensitivity to colours are apparent:

> It must have been a day in April. What other month could give me such blue and white, such sun and wind? The clothing on the lines was horizontal and shuddering, the sharp, carved clouds hurried, the sun spattered from the soap suds in the gutter, the worn bricks were bright with a dashing of rain. It was the sort of wind that gives grown ups headaches and children frantic exaltation" (*FF*, 20)

Dickson claims that this description is "as vivid as an imagist poem. (Dickson, 71). The poetic language is also a symptom of potential for spirituality and compassion, capacity for love and fancy that cannot be analyzed in rationalistic terms. Constantly changing (kaleidoscopic) colour images in chapter three draw the implied reader's attention to the metaphor of purity and absolute freedom in childhood, the impressions and reminiscences of which are filled with what we might describe as colourful brush strokes:

> Let me think in pictures again. If I imagine heaven metaphorically dazzled into colours, the pure white light spread out in a cascade richer than a peacock's tail then I see one of the colours lay over me. I was innocent of guilt, unconscious of innocence; happy, therefore, and unconscious of happiness. Perhaps the full sheaf of colours is never to be experienced by the human being since if he experiences these colours, they must lie in the past or someone else" (FF, 77-78).

Sammy-the-character often thinks about Beatrice from the perspective of a painter. He remembers "watch[ing] her unpaintable, indescribable face." (*FF*, 84). Sammy-the-narrator ironically uses the word "unpaintable" because he knows exactly what he is doing: "Oh, the calculated stories! Pleasant young man into the

picture; erasing the other Sammy, so incalculable, insolent and namelessly vicious" (84). However, the implied reader finds something beyond mere calculations about the personality of the young lover. The scenes, through focalizations, provide the implied reader with valuable data to understand the way Sammy-the-character perceives Beatrice, and this holds significant clues about him and human nature. The fact that he constantly gives colourful images concerning Beatrice, for example, "the imagined passion of bed" (107), "a hot breath at the thought of it" (107), "her sweet body" (109), her "untouched content" (112), "her nun-like innocence" avoiding the "deep and muddy pool" (112), shows that he is "obsessed with" (Dickson, 72) the image of her "white and sweet" body. Therefore, he says that "I could not paint her face but her body" (123) and the "light" on her face failed because of him. Sammy-the-narrator realizes that Sammy-the-character denied love as an abstract and exalted means of existence but conceived of it as the solid beauty and "perfection of her white, sweet, cleft flesh" (123). So, "the light from the window [that] strikes gold from her hair" (123) has no associations with Dante's Beatrice, and it is quite understandable that a painted perfection without the beauty of the face is a baffling image: "she baffles me still, she is opaque" (113). Thus, without her face, Beatrice's "nun-like innocence" sounds "non-like." Love turns out to be a kind of exploitation then, and images pertaining to filth, dirt, and the excrement of Rotten Row, which pure Beatrice has nothing to do with, culminate in the abused and betrayed Beatrice's urination on the floor during Sammy's visit. The experienced Beatrice , therefore, "paints" a picture of her own "stagnant pool," a recurrent image used by the narrator.

Recurrent images of darkness on different narrative levels are really suggestive in *FF*. Concerning the story in the narrative, darkness refers to childhood fears, the war, the P.O.W. experience, and confrontation with the central darkness in self. Darkness, as pictured through the narrative, is also a reference to the irrational realm of the human psyche, which is particularly focalized and conveyed through breaking down the chronological development of the temporal structure in the novel. The most significant scene associated with

darkness is Sammy's psychological torment in an utterly dark place where Sammy-the-character "confronts beasts of his own making" (Dickson, 72) and the invented dark cell becomes for him a mirror of the subconscious and a place of horrors, having been "created *ex nihilo* by the perverse imagination of a fallen man" (Baker, 65) . Sammy feels locked in a pit of imaginary beasts such as "scorpions" and "vipers" and is faced with his subconscious fears through the medium of darkness. Boyd regards these fears the cupboard as "invisible and unspeakable horror" (Boyd, 76). In this invisible horror, what tortures Sammy is not only Halde, but also his own mind "that creates terrors in the dark" and renders this place and his mind "a torture chamber" (Boyd, 76). It also becomes another metaphor of "the exploration of the dark centre" which was earlier described as an "unfathomable and invisible darkness that sits at the centre of him (FF, 8). However, it is seen that, as already Boyd puts, "the darkness is made visible and fathomed" by Sammy-the-narrator through the eyes of Sammy-the-character although the "the pictures of torment were unformed" and "generalized" (166). Sammy-the-character, frequently referring to the world of walls, "creates the horrors of his own hell" (Boyd, 76). The implied reader understands that Sammy is not only obsessed with the whiteness of the flesh and darkness at the centre but also with walls and doors. Johnson considers the doors as "brackets" in the narrative progression (Johnson, 68) and argues that the door motif recurs

> Both at the structural and thematic levels. In the former instance, the placement of the two doors, the "burst" door of chapter nine's last sentence and the door which opens at the last page, actually serves to emphasize the two narrative modes, operating as "brackets" so that "the shuffle and the coil" of the spiritual narrative is veritably "suspended" within the physical world of the rational narrative (Johnson, 68).

So, images of darkness and doors can have a thematic function in the sense that these images may indicate shifts between the two worlds. Johnson states again that doors are instruments to "discover a means of re-entry into the world of spirit" (68) as can be seen in Sammy's following remarks: "I cried out not with hope of an ear but as accepting a shut door, darkness and a shut sky (184). Thus,

the shut door stands for imprisonment and "its opening by contrast implies a liberation from that confinement" (Johnson, 69). The opening door on the last page, however, comes to represent his re-entrance into the physical world but in a spiritually enlightened manner. In the multilayered narrative parts, that is, in the cell episodes ("subconscious timelessness and the inventions of the mind" within "past experience of darkness, the cell" within "the present narration"), Sammy-the-narrator focalizes Sammy-the-character focalizing the source of his psychological torture:

> Who is there? My voice was close to my mouth as the darkness was to the balls of my eyes […] I felt smooth Stone or concrete. I had a sudden panic fear from my back and scrabbled round in the darkness and then round again. Now I could no longer remember where the door was […]My fingers found the bottom of a wall and instantly I doubted that it was a wall […] Not a corridor. A cell then, with concrete walls and floor and and a wooden door" (166-171)

In fact, that chamber of horror is only a broom closet with a damp mop in the centre of the floor. Sammy, however, under the influence of his own darkness inside, "imagines the worst," (Dickson, 72). The "invisible" darkness leads him to confrontation with the darkness inside, his sense of guilt, spiritual isolation and loss of freedom. So, Sammy-the-character appears to be very "susceptible to [his] primitive fears" (179). For example, this is evident in his instinctive response: his hand suddenly recoils when he touches the damp mop in the dark. Sammy-the-narrator describes his own hand as "a hand highly trained by the tragedies of a million years" (179).

Besides, in the ultimate experience of darkness, Sammy-the-character is perceived as mistaking a peace of rag with an invented object of the mind and detecting the smell of an imagined severed penis, which symbolizes his subconscious fears:

> The thing was cold. The thing was soft. The thing was like an enormous dead slug […] They had laid there this fragment of human flesh, collapsed in its own cold blood. So the lights fell and spun and blood that was pumped out

> of the heart was visible too, like a sun's corona, was part noise, part feeling, part light.
> A darkness ate everything away.
> […]
> My nose now noticed in the air, noticed and tried to reject, certain elements other than the fetor of confinement (*FF*, 181-182)

Sammy-the-narrator-focalizer, in this scene, attempts to reveal (through focalization from within) the dreamlike experience of the character and focalizes, in Bal's technical terms, imperceptible objects. Again it is seen that the narrator focalizer focalizes the character focalizing the objects. Thus, Sammy-the-character can "project his own sexual guilt" (Dickson, 73) in the form of a cut penis of a decaying dead body (in fact it was an imagined object). This objective correlative stimulates his (and the implied reader's) sense perception (smelling) but in fact it is the product of the character's own imagination. Cutting off the sexual organ shows that Sammy hysterically tries to "objectify his own diseased spirit" (Dickson, 73). The "smell" of a cut penis that is perceived through the mind of the character presents us with a striking example of focalization: "The thing was cold. The thing was soft. The thing was slimy. The thing was like an enormous dead-slug − dead because where the softness gave way under searching tips it did not come back again" (181). It stands, in Freudian terms, for the subconscious fear of castration and, in spiritual terms, for his isolation by a deep sense of guilt. The so-called cell door opens to release Sammy-the-character from prison, he gets back to the physical world, but with "a spiritual insight bringing together compassion and forgiveness" (Johnson, 66), the pictures from the past and the present thoughts and feelings are released to gain spiritual insight. This suggests that Sammy is no longer free but not completely devoid of spirituality.

5.4. Communication between the Rational and the Spiritual Worlds

Sammy-the-narrator's attempt to review his own life is a positive gesture to bridge the irrational and the rational worlds. It seems that the very presence of this narrative with an I-narrator whose narration covers different worlds and

realms revealed through the mind is an attempt to build a connection between polarities. When the struggle of the "artist" to portray himself with the two dimensions of his existence is taken into consideration, the art of storytelling, literature in general, can be thought of as, in Sammy-the-narrator's terms, "an appropriate pattern" for understanding the human self. He claims to use art/literature because it is different from philosophical conceptions; as Sammy-the-narrator states "I have hung all systems on the wall like a row of useless hats. They do not fit" (*FF*, 6) and he says "perhaps reading [telling] my story through again I shall see the connection between the little boy, clear as spring water, and the man like a stagnant pool" (9). Now, in the mind of the-I-narrator (also on the purely spatial realm of the text comprising the past, the present, the dreams etc.), both exist together. Sammy-the-narrator notes towards the end of the novel that "for an instant out of time, the two worlds existed side by side" (217).

The novel presents the implied reader with a problematic dualism. The consciousness, memory and the mind confront the complexity of life's various dimensions, which renders the final stance of Sammy-the-character devoid of absolute meaning, leaving it to the "shuffling" implications of the narrative. Towards the end of the narrative, the desperate Sammy-the-character, caught in a deep sense of meaninglessness, visits Nick Shales and Miss Pringle and concludes that "both worlds are real [but] there is no bridge" (253). Johnson claims that "this statement ends Sammy's quest, his pursuit of freedom which is predicated on finding a bridge in order to reopen the door to the spiritual world, to find redemption for his past sins" (Johnson, 65). Dickson, however, considers the possibility of a bridge, mentioning "some connexion between [Sammy's] two worlds of experience: the rational and the spiritual" (Dickson, 63).

Having already lost his freedom, Sammy-the-character destroyed the idea of bridge between the two worlds, but nevertheless, as Dickson suggests, Sammy's act of rewriting/rereading his own story marks a "bridge" between them. Sammy-the-character may look like "someone else" to Sammy-the-narrator, but the one lives in the other. The moral allegory of the novel, too, requires that both

the rational and the irrational worlds be real for Sammy, and that human beings have the potential to face and suffer from their misdeeds. Golding, in an interview, draws attention to this paradox. He claims, as we have seen, that for Sammy-the-character either of these two worlds never "really makes sense because the other exists" (Biles. ed., 82). Gindin, considering the theme of loss of free will, claims that

> Golding in this novel keeps insistence on "there is no bridge" […] *FF* provides no 'bridge' and resolves no human dilemmas. Rather, the novel traces the process through time of one social and historical man becoming representative of contemporary manifestations of evil" (Gindin, 48, 49).

However, dualism in *FF*, is also deconstructed through the narrative technique, since it is not treated as a fixed and unchangeable state of being. Sammy-the-narrator states that "art is partly communication but only partly. The rest is discovery, I have always been the creature of discovery" (102). Gindin may be right to claim that Sammy-the-character is a "representation of contemporary manifestation of evil," but Sammy-the-narrator locates himself and his narration at another level of understanding, which never refers only to the realm of rationality because it cannot explain the human self completely. Instead, it should be thought of as a more dynamic process in which boundaries are dissolved and frames are violated.

"Dualism" states Johnson, "is not a mere static rendering of conflicting forces but a progressive complication of them" (Johnson, 63). Both Sammy and Halde, for example, have an inclination towards rationality, "yet [they are] keenly aware of their forfeited spiritual natures" (Johnson, 63). Halde says "One must be for or against. I made my choice with much difficulty but I have made it." (140) Again, he adds in the following pages "And between the poles of belief. I mean the belief in material things and the belief in a world made and supported by a supreme being, you oscillate jerkily from day do day, from hour to hour" (144). But, Sammy-the-narrator thinks that "there are no morals that can be deduced from natural science" (226) and knows that one cannot "choose rationalism

rationally" (250). Halde is right to point to Sammy's oscillation and what Sammy-the-narrator does through narration is connected to Sammy-the-character's jerky oscillation. In his description of Beatrice, for example, this oscillation is evident:

> How big is a feeling? Where does an ache start and end. […] I have said that our decisions are not logical but emotional. We have reason and [we] are irrational. It is easy now to be wise about her […] She was Beatrice Ifor; and besides that unearthly expression, that holy light, she had knees sometimes silk and young buds that lifted her blouse when she breathed […] A blinding contradiction (*FF*, 222).

Here, the word "ache" is important, because Sammy is a suffering character, he lost his freedom, he committed sin but he never lost his potential for pain, which obliged (even forced) him to review his own past and retell his story. His sensitivity to beauty as an artist and to evil as a writer is obvious in the following remarks. He says "I was deciding right and wrong were nominal and relative, I felt, I saw the beauty of holiness and tasted evil in my mouth like the taste of vomit" (226). Sammy-the-narrator's constant interior monologues, as Dickson puts, "dramatize the psychological conflicts that torment the psyche of modern humanity" (Dickson, 74). Here, the word "dramatization" is of great significance since it refers to the act of narration, and second, dramatization (narration in our context) implies a strong sense of awareness of the conflict. The opposing worlds of rationality and spirituality could not be bridged by Sammy-the-character but Sammy-the-narrator seems to achieve this through his act of narration. If there is awareness then it is possible to bridge the opposing worlds, that is, to discover the one in the other. Sammy-the-narrator tries to overcome the paradox and reflects Sammy-the-character through his self-conscious narration, the past through the present, the temporal through the spatial. Therefore, Dickson anticipates a hope for bridge in Sammy's very act of questioning (74):

> I say it [this story] rather, perhaps to explain what sort of young man I was − explain it to myself. I can think of no other audience. I am here as well as on canvas, a creature of discovery rather than communication. And all the time, oscillating between resentment and gratitude" (*FF*, 103).

Here the "oscillation between resentment and gratitude" is a sign of spirituality. Unlike Dr. Halde, Sammy has not lost his spiritual/irrational aspect completely. So, a possible idea of bridge is realized in his self-discovery through the act of narration, in which the mind of the character occupies a functional post. Although Sammy-the-character claims that the two worlds exist side by side" (217), Sammy-the-narrator is inclined to receive them as an interwoven corpus. This presents the implied reader with another paradoxical pattern: On the one hand, Self and selfishness and on the other, identity and creativity. Here, identity and creativity refer to Sammy-the-narrator (narration, text, narrative discourse) while selfishness refers to Sammy-the-character (story). It is clear that both are combined and interwoven throughout the narrative.

Sammy-the-character is subject to some philosophical confrontations (sets of ideas represented by the characters) as well, but in this case the art of painting, which signals the potential for creation and holds some clues about his upcoming act of writing, turns into a bridge to (re)view what really has happened. He can, therefore, "trace the duality from its most simplistic to an increasingly complex rendering" (Johnson, 63) and his search for a bridge becomes part of the bridge itself because, thanks to the pictures that he later on draws, he is able to "touch" his past as freshly as it was. So Sammy-the-narrator now acknowledges "the moral order, sin and remorse" (Dickson, 69), he thinks that both worlds exist side by side but he also states: "They meet in me" (*FF*, 211). This "meeting" is an implicit revelation of the possibility of a bridge. Therefore, Halde, seeing the impression of this potential in Sammy, says: "But there is a mystery in you which is opaque to both of us" (145). Whether Sammy-the-narrator and the implied reader are convinced of the possibility of a bridge is questionable, but there is still hope because "everything [is] relative, nothing absolute" (*FF*, 150).

It is known, however, that the confusing ending of the novel may lead the implied reader, like Sammy-the-narrator, to an enigma. The reason why the implied author "wilfully obscures" the narrative is quite puzzling. On the one hand, states Johnson, the puzzling ending can be taken as "an integral part of the

novel's structure [which] elaborates and ultimately clarifies the quest dramatized at the thematic level" (Johnson, 66). On the other hand, there is a sign of hope/bridge in this puzzling because Sammy-the-narrator seems to recognise the human potential for spirituality and freedom of choice. Even if he cannot put his newly recognised sense of freedom into action in the real world, he, as a narrator, has the freedom of selection and attains a power to merge and interweave different perceptions into a narrative whole. Thus, Johnson accepts that reality is "shifting, incomprehensible and ambiguous" (Johnson, 62) and that there is a "relationship (a bridge)" between two forces (Johnson, 63). It is also very interesting that the same Johnson talks of the "deconstruction of the dualism" in *FF* (Johnson, 64). It is seen that in order to interpret the ending of the novel, critics and readers such as Johnson should carry out a "quest," which can reach a point where Sammy-the-narrator and the implied reader "refute Sammy's observation that there is no bridge" (Johnson, 68). So, in this novel, "recognition" and "destruction" progress hand in hand. What narration or "language conceal[s] or reveal[s]" (Johnson, 63) is doubtful at this point. If there were no bridge rebuilt through narration, how could it be possible to regain "simplistic childhood perception [that] gives way to a reality that is challenged, reconsidered, even obfuscated by contradicting realities" (Johnson, 63). As a result, Johnson seems to be convinced that *FF* is "a projection of two forces interacting closely" (65) and this interaction underlines the fact that "inner is [becomes] outer" and "mind and universe [are] equated" (Johnson, 65) in the narrative. This, again, creates an idea of a bridge between the mind (language and narration) and universe (events in every category, story).

One important point to help the attentive reader to recognise a possible bridge between the two worlds is the very existence of the characters, who retain a potential for existing in both worlds. This is implied by Sammy-the-narrator when he says it is "useless to say that a man is a whole continent, pointless to say that each consciousness is a whole world because each consciousness is a dozen worlds (*FF*, 189). The characters in *FF* are torn between these worlds and mostly caught up in a struggle for integrity, particularly Sammy-the-character and Beatrice. Sammy-the-character is torn between Nick Shales' scientific method

(rationality) and Miss Pringle's religious world (spirituality), from which God and compassion for humanity have disappeared respectively. However, their own existence stands for both splitting and the possibility of a bridge at the same time, because Nick Shales, with his generosity and human love, proves to have a potential for spirituality while rough Pringle, with her stern manners, exhibits a paradoxical way of behaviour which contradicts with her spiritual point of view. They are just like the universe: "The universe, marvellous though it is, is not driven by divine love but by physical laws." (*FF*, 66) It is possible to think otherwise. Opposing world-views are represented and brought together by, particularly, Nick Shales and Rowena Pringle, who have shaped the personality of Sammy-the-character. Sammy is in a way a co-product, suggesting the simultaneous presence of the different worlds. This is an explicit representation, on the one hand, of the opposition, and on the other hand, of connection. Therefore,

> Sammy's feeling that the two world views are mutually exclusive is replaced at last by a conviction that miraculously both are true. Of each individually the best can be said is 'maybe': a thorough conviction of the truth of one to the exclusion of the other yields a distorted and narrow view of the world. At the close of the novel, however, Sammy does not seem fully to have learned the lesson of 'maybe' (Boyd, 73).

The recurrent and somewhat crucial verbal gesture, "maybe," in Beatrice's case, manifests itself as a sign of vulnerability, naivety and lack of awareness but also it is a sign of ultimate potential for both the worlds in man. The two worlds live side by side in one single life or self/mind/memory, but it does not mean that these split worlds cannot be bridged. In fact, they are bridged by the mind and memory of Sammy-the-narrator, and, therefore, by the act of narration. The lesson of "maybe" is obvious, for example, when Sammy-the-character differentiates Nick Shales from his philosophy although it is possible to "confuse love for his teacher with love for rationalism" (Johnson, 63). Nick Shales is a fervent supporter of scientific rationalism on the one hand, but on the other hand he is "an unwitting spiritualist filled with a love of people, a selflessness" (Johnson, 63). In fact,

Sammy is "not full of science but 'poetry'" (63). As for Miss Pringle, it is seen that she is mentally "spiritual" but in terms of behaviour "a die-heart rationalist" (63). This ambiguity in personality holds another clue for a bridge itself. Dr. Halde, in contrast, has no inner capacity for spirituality since he has lost his belief in the irrational, and become completely deprived of spiritual compassion for others. It is implied in *FF* that

> Halde's inhumanity results from his limited view; he sees only with the scientist's eye. Though he knows a lot about human beings, he cannot foresee the spiritual illumination granted the fallen man (Dickson, 70)

As regards Beatrice, the implied reader learns about the purity of Beatrice through Sammy's somewhat poetic narration, from whose point of view Beatrice looks like an angel. In these lines, there is a reference to the world of morality, and this might build up a bridge between the physical beauty of Beatrice and Sammy's love for her. He declares to her that she [is] "the sun and the moon for" him and "without her he [should] die." He also promises to love her for ever: "I have loved you from the first day and I always shall" (*FF,* 90). As the narrative progresses Sammy-the-narrator's declaration gets stronger and more poetic:

> I said I loved you. Oh, God don't you know what that means? I want you, I want all of you, not just cold kisses and walks- I want to be with you and in you and on you and round you –I want fusion and identity- I want to understand and be understood – oh, God, Beatrice, Beatrice, I love you – and I want to be you!" (105).

The betrayal and abuse of Beatrice by Sammy-the-character underlines the destructive power of the selfish [profane] love and points to two different portrayals of Beatrice: "Dante's [sacred] love translates Beatrice into heaven and eternal life, Sammy's reduces Beatrice Ifor to animal status and living death" (Friedman, 78). Moreover, the scene, in which Beatrice urinates on the floor in hospital during the new Sammy's visit after his release from the camp, emphasizes this contradiction. The physical world subject to scientific analysis

seems to prevail over idealized romance and the spiritual. Nevertheless, a strong sense of guilt and regret evokes the possibility of redemption through Sammy's so-called pilgrimage to hospital.

Briefly, *FF* deals with first person retrospective narration, that is, experiments with rewriting one's own story to search and reconstruct his identity. What makes it most interesting from the narratological point of view is that the novel has a first person narrator who, as a narrating agent, dominates the act of narration and focalizations, but on the other hand, is also aware of his status as both the character and the narrator. Sammy is a self-conscious narrator and frequently refers to different aspects of storytelling like remembering, writing, telling, selecting or organizing as well as trying to explore the themes of freedom, individuality and conflict between spiritual and rational realms and carries out a search through narration. Sammy Mountjoy is therefore at the cutting edge of creativity because he conceives himself as an object of his creation. So, the close relationship between technique and meaning is particularly evident in Sammy's attempt to rewrite/retell his own story, which makes it possible to confront his own past and identity, and more importantly, to carry out a search for an appropriate pattern for life. Sammy-the-narrator's technique of retrospection, therefore, is a strategy for search through narration, and, as he implies at the beginning of the novel, retelling one's own story can provide us with an appropriate means of understanding life. Thus, the implied reader is involved not only in reading but also in writing (the act of narration).

The implied reader is also involved in a process of becoming, following up the reminiscences and scenes from the past, either real or not, which are conveyed through second degree narratives and numerous focalizations again. Sammy-the-narrator's progress toward self knowledge about Sammy-the-character is presented by a distorted chronology, thus referring the implied reader to both the selective authority and monitor-ity of the narrator-focalizer and the mechanism of recollection taking place in one's mind. Again, the implied author employs a

narrative gimmick, revealing the cell experience invented by the suffering mind of the character. So, besides constant breaks in the linearity of temporal structure, the novel also breaks down the rational boundaries, and attempts to open up new ways of perception in this experience of darkness used to reveal the character's subconsciousness. Thus, the flashback technique, deliberate distortion of chronology and focalizations from within at different levels help the implied author to illustrate or "translate" the "incoherence" of Sammy's life, into Sammy-the-narrator's relatively understandable terms.

CONCLUSION

In order to investigate the relations between narrative strategies and the production of meaning, this dissertation has referred to a semiotic model offered by Booth (1961) and included a study of the Genettean theory of narratology in the first chapter. It has explained the elements of narration/diegesis and dealt with the categories of the implied author and the implied reader. It has also reviewed the main terminology that comprise the terms concerning "voice" (narrators and narrative levels), "mood/perspective" (focalizers and focalizations) and temporal arrangements (Genette: 1972; Rimmon-Kenan: 1983). The next three chapters on *IN*, *PM*, and *FF* have included the technical analyses of the novels and focused on uncovering and discussing the relationship between the narrative strategies and already established interpretations.

This dissertation focused on the author's production of certain meanings (which seems related to Golding's moral issues) through certain narrative strategies. Considering literary criticism in general, Genette states that "until now, critics have done no more than interpret literature" (*Narrative Discourse Revisited*, 157) and Dickson suggests that exploring the major themes of Golding's novels cannot "account for his achievement as a novelist" (Dickson, 135), for his novels, as Norman Page maintains, owe much to "variety" and "unpredictability" in terms of narrative technique (12). Also, Redpath reminds us that critical approaches to Golding's novels need alternative readings with respect to narrative structures (204).

This study is remarkable because it presents an application of Genettean narrative theory (1983 [1972]) to Golding's fiction, and in integrating the results of such analysis to the existing interpretations. That is, in Rimmon-Kenan's terms, the present study has drawn attention to the "rhetoricity and fictionality" of the novels (Rimmon-Kenan:1983, 131) and shown the implied author and narrating agents at work. According to Genette, such an analysis helps to read a story also

as a story of its own narration. This type of reading is a "practical" reading (Genette, *Narrative Discourse Revisited*, 157) that aims at showing clearly the relationship between technique and meaning at several levels, from the explicit level to the deeper ones. So, this dissertation tried to "unearth narrative elements in texts" (Rimmon-Kenan, 131) to investigate "fundamental operations" in narrative fiction as "a signifying system" (Rimmon-Kenan, 131) and thus "transforms" (Genette: 1983, 157) the narrative texts into fictional entities that produce meanings. This provides current readings with a literary ground on which attentive readers can gain new insights into the process of storytelling. Such analyses serve to recognise the distinction between who speaks and who perceives and how and to what extent these categories are related to the question of distance, time, narrative levels and perspective. The dissertation has also demonstrated that they are manipulated by the narrating agents (narrator-focalizers in *IN* and *PM*, and Sammy-the-narrator/focalizer in *FF*).

This research into Golding's novels concludes that in the three novels studied here, the narrator-focalizers and character focalizers are to a large extent concerned with "perception" and "perceiving", which creates a sense of monitority as well as authority. The "implied authorship" (Lanser, 13) represented by the voice of the narrators and their act of narration having "diegetic and mimetic authority" (Lanser, 13-15) is balanced or accompanied by focalizers' monitoring /perceiving acts. The intricate organization of narrative levels and levels of focalizations by the implied author is reflected through the verbal medium, by which the attentive reader can follow the indications of narrative variations and Golding's critical strategy of perspectivisation. It has shown that not only the narrators but also the characters are potential focalizers, who "enable the reader to see events through the perceptual screen" (Jahn, 175). In this sense, focalization is a crucial aspect of narration, and, as Mieke Bal proposes, it appears to be an "ideological" indicator. Bal's "ideological speaker" (1991, 75) comprises a potential for ideological representation (representation of the mindset and mood of the focal agents) through the specific way of perceiving the events or objects. Thus, in the three novels under consideration, extradiegetic narration with the

"highest authority" (Lancer, 13-14) is considerably violated by focalizers' act of focalizations (that signal their monitor-ity). In *IN* and *PM*, for example, the highest level of authority of the extradiegetic-heterodiegetic narrators is manipulated by focal monitor-ity which is constantly varying between the narrators and the characters. In *IN* the authority belongs for the most part of the narrative to the narrator but his/her monitority is shared by the focal characters. In *PM*, the voice of the narrator implies a strong diegetic and mimetic authority but the centre's monitor-ity forms the backbone of the narrative. At the end of the novel, when the highest narrative level is reinstated, however, the narrator's authority prevails over that of the centre's (Martin's), and monitor-ity is taken over by the agency of limited omniscience. In *FF*, even though one of the aspects (person) of the highest level of narration is homodiegetic (Sammy narrates Sammy's story), implied authorship is allied with monitor-ity. In this novel, the artist narrator / the protagonist is very much concerned with monitoring the past events and his monitor-ity prevails over his implied authority because he deliberately concerns himself with reviewing the scenes from his childhood, adolescence and adulthood.

Moreover, these novels burden the implied reader with simultaneous double readings. Each novel includes a crucial section that creates an important gap between the perspectives; the epigraph in *IN*, the coda in *PM* and the so-called "cell" experience in *FF* play an important role in stimulating the reader's double reading. Furthermore, variations in the narrative levels and levels of focalizations indicate shifts in perspectives. The events are revealed through narrative levels which are interwoven with focalizations. In *IN*, the implied reader should deal with the changing mood/perspective of the narration. From Lok's perspective, s/he perceives the world shaped by the language of the Neanderthal man, but simultaneously compares the new image of the Neanderthal man with that of the epigraph. S/he is also exposed to the world of the extradiegetic narrator through his highly developed, and also poetic, language. The reader may share the narrator's view since both the reader and the narrator appear to be in the same linguistic realm. When Lok's mind is perceived as dealing with an object (a boat

for example) the implied reader simultaneously perceives it from two different perspectives (the boat is a "hollow log" from Lok's perspective) (198). In a similar vein, the world reflected in Lok's mind and described by the invisible third person narrator are somewhat different and the attentive reader again should attend to this gap. In *PM*, the implied reader is supposed to read two stories at the same time: Martin marooned on the imaginary rock in the Atlantic and the actor Martin with all his misdeeds. Martin's struggle against physical death and his mental struggle against the idea of death on the highest narrative level, and on the other, the implied reader penetrates Pincher Martin's past and the narrative enables the reader to perceive Martin's extraordinary experience through his mind. The story turns out to be a post-mortem story in the coda, and, upon learning that Martin's struggle against death is in vain, and he has already died, the reader needs to review (reread) all that has been narrated. Finally, in *FF*, the implied reader is supposed to read two stories again: Sammy-the-narrator and Sammy-the-character's stories. In this novel, s/he identifies with Sammy-the-narrator retelling and reviewing his own story. The implied reader, therefore, should simultaneously follow up the character in process (becoming) and the creator (painter) of this character at work since Sammy's self conscious narration needs a conscious and attentive reading.

As a result of this search, we understand that narrative strategies related to "voice", "mood/perspective" and temporal organisations serve to create certain situations in which William Golding locates his characters to reveal a lesson (meaning) that is clearly related to the characters' (and also the readers') sense and search of identity. At first sight, the novel's moral aspects, as critics have noted, seem relatively apparent and seem to subordinate the technical aspects of the novels, which operate as narrative instruments behind these allegories. The implied author sometimes deals with shifting focalizations in order to reveal different aspects of the same object/image and perceives the events from different perspectives and thereby undermines established dichotomies (*IN*), sometimes plays with temporality to explore the post-mortem experience of a God-resisting soul (*PM*), and sometimes uses a first person (and also self-conscious)

retrospective narration so as to reconstruct the self and identity and to review the process of becoming (*FF*). In these novels, the characters' distorted vision (in terms of theme and technique) is revealed and healed through the viewing (Lok, Martin) and reviewing (Martin, Sammy) of the events; and the characters are portrayed as facing a failure to understand themselves (or the human self). These novels, therefore, provide the reader not only with what the human self/identity can "be" but also with how it can be perceived. So, in these novels "narration" and "focalization" appear to be both a formal and thematic technique. Considering a phenomenon from different perspectives, as Sammy suggests, can be an appropriate strategy or pattern for the creation of art and recognition of life.

Without other interpretive efforts, Genette's practical approach goes no further than describing what is already there and can be considered to be a limitation. However, in combination with interpretations of the texts' "messages", we can see how a meaning is created and conveyed at many levels of communication (narration), including that of narrative strategies and techniques. Pure Genettean analysis, therefore, can lead to the denial of meaning outside of the text (from a post-structural point of view, there is nothing outside of the text). Nevertheless, it is possible, and seems wise, to combine narratology with different views of literature and meaning, as has been done here.

As a result, on the surface level these novels present us with the stories of different characters (narrative as the story with a plot structure); on the discourse level, the narratives narrate the stories of their own narration (narrative as text/fiction); and finally on the deepest level, *IN* reveals the human being with the capacity for good and evil and for the recognition of fear. Nevertheless, the novel suggests that reconciliation between different sides and perspectives is possible. *PM*, portrays the inner self as inflicted with evil and weakness. The self is still struggling against nonexistence but the novel implies that human being is helpless in the face of death. *FF*, retains a hope for goodness, even though the spiritual side of the human being cannot be completely remedied, the self has a potential for understanding and compensation through art and creation. In conclusion, Golding

has allowed his lessons to be obtained only by attending to the combination of narrative strategies, that is, the author has “sugared the pill.”

ENDNOTES

[1] The term "diegesis" is originated in Plato's Republic (Book III) referring to the indirect presentation (narration) of the events. Genette and Rimmon-Kenan refer to the term as "story."

[2] So, Genette states that "narrative mimesis is the illusion of mimesis" and he adds "mimesis in words can only be mimesis of words" (163, 164).

[3] Barthes calles it "L'Effet de réel" (Genette, 165).

[4] "Attentive reader" is not included in the commonplace terminology but used sometimes by narrative theoreticians such as Genette (1972, 1987), Jahn (2007). It merely denotes a reader who is over-involved in a text and aware of the rhetoric and structure. So, s/he is supposed to be able to see beyond what is being told.

[5] By the "real author", we we do not mean the "name of the author" recorded on a book. Genette notes that the name of the author is not completely excluded from the interpretative scope of a text. In this case, the name of the author turns into a paratextual element (*Paratexts*, 37) but still remains within the frame of the text and does not necessarily refer to the real author.

[6] Plato conceives of "diegesis" as part of "mimesis" but Genette considers "diegesis" an independent notion and used it as "narration," which aims to create an illusion of mimesis. He believes that pure mimesis and imitation are impossible through language, because it signifies without imitating (185-186).

[7] T has an actional function. The very act of storytelling is as important as what is being told, that is, the narrator narrates for the sake of narration.

[8] Rimmon-Kenan call them "hypodiegetic narratives" (1983: 91)

[9] Rimmon-Kenan calls it "explicative function" (1983: 92).

[10] As we do with the narrators, we can classify a narratee who is absent from the story as hetero-diegetic, whereas a narratee is called homodiegetic when s/he is a character (Genette, 259).

[11] Genette considers such author-ity together with ideological function of a narrator.

[12] Remember, Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* with multiple perspectives and Joyce's *Portraitof the Artist*, with a single perspective.

[13] Friedman seems to believe that the objective lens of a camera can remain "objective," and diegesis in a dramatic mode can present the events without any selection or organisation. However, the very idea of a camera necessarily brings to mind a certain perspective. Genette's nonfocalization (or zero focalization) is therefore questioned and denied by a number of critics such as Bal, Rimmon-Kenan, Phelan and Jahn.

[14] "Focalization" (Genette, 1972; Rimmon-Kenan, 1983; Mieke Bal, 1985) is an important invention because it solves a critical problem of whose point of view orients the narrative perspective. It is generally understood by the Anglo American tradition of literary criticism as point of view. But "point of view" is a confusing term and complicates the differentiation between who tells and who perceives. Porter Abbot argues that the term "point of view" is vaguer than focalization (2002: 66).

[15] Nelles's (1997: ch. 3) five modes of perception through focalization: "ocularization, auricularization, gustavization, olfactivization, tactivilization" referring respectively to "sight,

sound, taste, smell, touch" (173) For example, D.H. Lawrence's short story "England, My England" presents these modes of focalization. This is the case with Lok in *IN*, as he more relies on sense perceptions than his intellectual capacity.

[16] Since Barthes' declaration of the death of the author, scholars have tried to "uncouple [texts] from the ideological commitments of the historical author" (Tambling, 38) but ideology cannot be totally suppressed or erased.

[17] According to Rimmon-Kenan and Mieke Bal (1997 [1985], 142), focalization is an essential element in narrative fiction. James Phelan (1988) agrees with them and argues that a narrative discourse provides its reader with at least one focalizing agent. Mieke Bal has proposed some emendations for the problem and argues that absence of focalization is another sort of focalization.

[18] It would be useful to remind ourselves here that Henry James called the focal character a "reflector" (McQuillan, 71), which seems a very suggestive wording in this context.

[19] He uses this only for internal focalization, as he priviledges it over the external.

[20] This dominant perspective can be thought of as belonging to the author but whose perspective orients the narration in this context is the question of narrator-focalizer that is the organizing agent in the text.

[21] Bakhtin argues that the novelist "does not strip away from the intentions of others, from heteroglot language of his works", but also states that "the author forces his own intentions" through the medium of common language (299-300).

[22] He studies the concept under the heading of Tense.

[23] Frequency refers to the relation between the number of times events occur and the number of times they are recounted. (Singulative-iterative-repeating)

[24] Remember Bergson's concept of "dureé" and spiritual/mental time as opposed to clock-time.

[25] Both, Booth and Rimmon-Kenan refer to (170-171) Fielding's *Tom Jones* because the narrator fills up such "vacant spaces of time with his own conjectures" and then leave Tom " a space of twelve years to exercise his talents."

[26] Genette draws attention to subsequent narration adopted by the classical epic. Because the events take place in the distant past in such narratives, he notes that the interval remains mostly indeterminate (220). In this dissertation novels employ subsequent narration but the interval is too short.

[27] Wells, H.G. *The Outline Of History*, (2 Volumes, Macmillian: 1926). Subtitled with "A Plain History Of Life And Mankind."

[28] The progression of the events is linear in terms of time but the structure of the narrative is circular in terms of perspective because it starts and ends with the modern human perspective but its sense of "disgust" and "fear" portrayed by the epigraph has changed.

[29] David Lodge, in his *Language of Fiction* states that "the novelist's médium is language: whatever he does, he does in and through language" (57). And, Margaret Sönmez, deals with the issue in terms of "language and communication" and draws attention to the significance of Neanderthal visual thought-processes in communication (1994).

[30] Adriaens calls this technique "animation" (48).

[31] Adriaens refers at this point to Jacobson's "metaphoric and metonymic poles of language (in Delbeare, 58)

[32] Horatschec reminds us Zachary's readings of Joseph Conrad's *Lord Jim* and Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day* and states that he "focuses on the Saying rather than the Said" (Horatschek, (13). She also notes that the field of narrative theory highlighted epistemological, psychological, and sociological dimensions of alterity (14).

[33] The idea of "other" operates on different levels: psychoanalytic, cultural or discursive. Mcquillan, in the "Introduction" to *The Narrative Reader*, discusses Lacan, Said and Foucault's view of otherness and argues that each narrative produces "narrative-marks" appealing to the other. According to him, a narrative-mark is "constituted in the form of a narrative" and is "meaningful" (16-25).

[34] Since the perspective has changed, the narrator-focalizer replaces "the new people" by "the people." Therefore, here the people denotes Homo sapiens.

[35] Crawford conceives of the novel particularly as having to do with the issue of holocaust. About atrocities, Golding states that they are "like the black holes in space […] We stand before a gap in history" (77). It seems that he attempts to deal with this gap.

[36] Because Martin has already died, it is weird to use the word consciousness. However, in the novel Martin's so-called consciousness is considerably lively and "the centre" serves to represent this active consciousness. So, this dissertation prefers to use (un)consciousness to refer to Martin's post-mortem condition and death-resisting consciousness.

[37] In this dissertation the protagonist is called Martin or Pincher Martin, not only Pincher on its own, because the name "Pincher" is a verbal indicator in terms of mood.

[38] This is the reason why Mieke Bal refers to the distinction between "technical speaker" (voice) and "ideological speaker" (focalizer). She therefore tries to draw our attention to the "non-coincidence of speaker and focalizer" (1991: 1-7).

[39] Manfred Jahn's term, see theory chapter.

[40] When the final chapter (the coda) is taken into consiideration, all these "focalizations from without" turn into "focaliztions from within." The implied author tries to create a sense of reality and for the most part of the narrative, the implied reader thinks that he observes Martin's striving for survival and perceives the struggle of his consciousness. Martin's words cause a confusion in (13) because according to the coda such statements are all interior monologues which refer to "focalization from within."

[41] A psychological point of view, says Paul Simpson referring to Uspensky, extends from authorial omniscience to a single character's restricted version of reality, and he argues that "authorial point of view relies on an individual consciousness" (12). Yet, in our context this statement can be revised as the authorial perspective being enriched by individual perceptions.

[42] This reversal also hints at the fact that the act of narration (persistence/existence through narration) prevails over the narrative itself.

[43] Thus, the narrative technique in *PM* differs from such narratives as Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway* using stream of consciousness technique in that *PM* not only violates temporal time but also lacks an outer reference such as clock-time. A referent with a certain temporal dimension completely disappears within the world of the character. There is not a striking clock or at least an ordered space according to which he could retain his sense of time.

[44] After reading the whole book, it is also possible to say that Martin can have died before. But, the ending of Chapter 1 is stil remarkable and indicates a gimmick of uncertainty.

[45] As explained in the theory chapter it refers to Manfred Jahn's "windows of focalization" model. In the novel Martin is portrayed as "seeing through a window" or "peering round a "window-frame" (82).

[46] Martin as character is a corrupt man but as a homodiegetic internal narrator-focalizer he is not; Martin is the product of a brilliant mind, he is a vivid construction made through suggestive narrative structures and of course he is not endless (immortal) within the boundaries of one narrative level and a certain perspective. As a narrative device this level is limited by some outer levels and a dominant perspective. Thus it can be said that Martin's "plotting" operates in at least two different ways, as a character (on story level) he is a man having plotted to carry out misdeeds against others, and as a narrative device (on narrative fiction level) "he" is a construct, endowed with an ephemeral voice and perspective, plotting to carry out an illusion for the implied reader. In the first he is a corrupt man craving for redemption, in the second a brilliant construct manipulating the extremes of narrative discourse.

[47] Indeed Martin can never exist without words, into which the character's vision, thought or speech has been translated. For Martin, self-presence is possible through writing as well as self denial and ultimate death, and he is made to admit that writing always means or signifies something other than itself, refers to something, an object or a concept, beyond the black marks on the white page. Borrowing the idea from Derrida, Redpath tries to find out what constitutes the final signified of the text, that is, the "absolute logos." He argues that "the new centre of the text, therefore, is located in that which creates and gives meaning to the text, just as Martin [is] the centre of his creation" (148-149). The intelligible face of the sign, however, in Derrida's terms, must be valid for every level of the text and therefore Martin can not be a centre in any of the levels in this context. Only in the context of narration does this status seem possible, because the character's perspective retains some sort of autonomy. When writing is concerned, it is mostly the implied author, not Martin, who tries to wield his author-ity over the written text.

[48] Such comments in a way become a kind of attestation which Genette calls the "testimonial function" (256). However, the presence of the narrator is not apparent, and the narrator hides himself from the text by attributing such comments to the protagonist's thoughts through focalization.

[49] From an interpretative point of view it is possible to consider the shape of the rock as a phallic image because the greedy Martin is also obsessed with sexuality as well as linguistic speculation.

[50] On story level there is no irony in this because neither the protagonist nor the implied reader knows what is happening. The irony is on the narrative level as the implied author knows what s/he is doing.

[51] Considering narrative levels, Martin experiences something spiritual. Actually, there is nothing spiritual but a textual event. Martin's so called relief is in fact the relief of a mind that loves telling-a story, and in its attempt to veil its textuality, the narrative fiction also exposes what is curtained. It can be argued that there is no factuality but textuality: whatever happens is in the text, all that is being narrated is narrated also for the sake of narration itself. This aspect of narration is as important as the rather serious question of Martin's death or experience in a fictitious purgatory.

[52] The novel reminds us of William Blake's *Songs of Innocence* and *Songs of Experience* and shows that Golding is one more time concerned with a deep rooted moral theme of irremediable sin.

[53] Kinkead-Weekes and Gregor draw attention to this similarity and state that "Mary has become Beatrice, Sammy is a subtilized Pincher (165). Oldsey makes another comparison between *FF* and Camus's *La Chute*, and claims that the two works have much in common. Monod also compares it to Malraux' *La Condition humaine (The Human Predicament).*

[54] In the novel, an idea of a true "pattern" is developed by the narrative itself and the narrator refers to it at the beginning of his narration. He asks, "Then why do I write this down? Is it a pattern I am looking for?" (*FF*, 6). As will be explained, his own narration/storytelling seems to be an appropriate pattern for understanding life.

[55] Sammy's quest for self-knowledge reminds us of an archetypal motif of journey and quest. In this context Johnson draws attention to Northrop Frye's "ironic mode", where the central figure of the fiction "achieves no quest" (71). Frye says "eventually it dawns on us that it is the reader who achieves the quest" (*Anatomy of Criticism, Four Essays,* pp. 323-324). The implied reader is again supposed to carry out a double reading because the narrative oscillates between Sammy's past and present. His quest is also the implied reader's quest.

[56] So, as Redpath states, "Golding writes Sammy writing" (Redpath,129).

[57] Redpath argues that the-I-narrator looks back and reflects on his past (himself) and underlines "the complex relationship of the first person pronoun to a complete understanding of the text" (136).

[58] "Fable," an essay largely concerned with meaning in Golding describes himself as a fabulist" (in *The Hot Gates* (London: Faber and Faber, 1965) pp.85-86).

[59] Redpath also maintains that "the reader recreates them in his reading" and "this re-creation is not external or confined to the text, it takes place as an internal process inside the reader" (136) through the process of "gather[ing] knowledge about the 'I's of *FF*" (137) but Golding in an interview stated that "[the reader] can understand it in a different way, but I would guess that he can't understand it in a better way" because "on the receiving end is the critic, and at the shooting end is the author" (Biles, 53)

[60] The retrospective narration of Sammy can also be characterized as "subsequent" or "ulterior" in Genettean terminology, see. Chp.I.

[61] According to Genette and Rimmon-Kenan, even this idea of a "fall" is a sign of unreliability as it refers to moral degradation and has some spiritual connotations. It can be concerned with the emotive function and function of attestation, underlining the sheer subjectivity of the narrator. It can be said that the narrator does not impose anything but is involved in a search for his own identity and past and there is a relationship between this intentional subjectivity / unreliability and the motif of quest.

[62] Golding claims that "neither of them really makes sense because the other exists" (Golding, in Biles, 82).

[63] Sammy's "inner journey, which accounts for the prevailing form of the novel" (Dickson, 66), which can be considered a "Künstlerroman" as well (Friedman, 81). Kunstlersroman, the pattern of falling to rise again in art is found, *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*] "The artist for art's sake must be both torturer and victim" (Boyd, 81).

[64] In the book, previously another scene, however, suggested friendship, hospitality and the "Rabelaisian" mood in Rotten Row. In that scene, the people were illustrated when they were welcoming a visitor "screaming with laughter" (20). It is understood that this is not the case with little Sammy's notorious mother.

[65] In this he resembles Martin. They both have 'sex' at the root of their faults (Boyd, 64).

[66] The signifying choice of Beatrice's surname, 'Ifor', can be read as 'If-or', an allusion to Betrice's insistent use of "maybe, or 'I-for', a reference to abuse and exploitation out of uncontrolled desires deriving from the darkness sitting at the centre of Sammy-the-character. This, according to Redpath, also implies "an acquisition of a self to the self: I-for-an-I" as Sammy's words suggest "I want to be you" (FF, 134), and it is seen that Sammy-the-character wants Beatrice as part of himself (Redpath, 133). :Sammy says: "I want you, I want all of you […] I want fusion and identity- I want to understand and be understood-oh God, Beatrice, I love you- I want to be you!" (*FF*, 105).

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Genette, Gerard. *Narrative Discourse, An Essay in Method*. Trans. J. E. Lewin. Ithaca&New York: Cornell University Press, [1972] 1981.

-------- *Narrative Discourse Revisited,* Trans. J. E. Lewin. Ithaca & New York: Cornell University Press, [1983] 1991.

Golding, William. *The Inheritors* (London: Faber&Faber) [1955] 1990.

--------*Pincher Martin* (London: Faber&Faber) [1956] 1990.

--------*Free Fall* (London: Faber&Faber) [1959] 1991.

Bal, Mieke. *Narratology, Introduction to the Theory of Narrative.* Second Ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Second Ed. London: Penguin Books, [1961] 1991.

Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (London: Routledge Press) [1983] 1999.

--------*Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. Second Ed. London: Routledge Press, [2002] 2008.

Secondary Sources

Abbot, Porter. *Introduction to Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2002, pp. 45-60.

Adriaens, "Style in the Inheritors". *Golding: The Sound of Silence*. Ed. Jeanne Delbeare. Brussels: Liege Language and Literature, 1991.

Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Altes, Liesbeth Korthals. "Ethical Turn". *Routledge Encyclopedia of*

Narrative Theory. Eds. Herman, D., Jahn, M. and Ryan M. London and New York: Routledge, 2005. pp. 142-146.

Aristotle. *Poetics*. Trans. J. Hutton. New York: W. w. Norton and Company Inc., 1982.

Arslan, Deniz. *The Concept of Evil in William Golding's Novels*. Ph.D. Thesis, Ankara Universitesi, 1997.

Austen, Jane. Persuasion. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics, 2000.

Baker, James R. *Critical Essays on William Golding*. Boston: Hall, 1988.

Bal, Mieke. *On Story-telling, Essays in Narratology*. Sonoma: Polbridge Press, 1991.

Bakhtin, Michael. "Discourse in the Novel" in *Dialogic Imagination*. Trans. C. Emerson and M.Holquist. Austin: University of Texas, 1992.

Barthes, Roland. "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives". *The Narrative Reader*. Ed. McQuillan, M. London and NewYork: Routledge, 2000. pp. 109-114.

Beckett, Samuel. *Trilogy (Molloy, Malone Dies and The Unnamable)*. London: Calder Publications, 1994.

Biles, Jack I. *Talk: Conversations wit William Golding*. NewYork: Harcourt Brace Publications, 1970.

Boyd, S.J. *The Novels of William Golding*. NewYork: Harvester- Wheatsheaf, 1990.

Brooks, Peter. *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. New York: Knopf Press, 1984.

Camus, Albert. *The Outsider*. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1988.

Carey, John. "William Golding Talks to John Carey". *The Man and His Books, A Tribute on his 75th Birthday*. Ed. J. Carey.London: Faber and Faber, 1986. pp. 172-189.

Chatman, Seymour. "Point of View" in *The Narrative Reader*. Ed. Martin McQuillan. London & NewYork: Routledge, 2000. pp.96-98.

Chatman, Seymour. "The Implied Author at Work". *Coming to Terms, The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness*. Middlesex, Penguin Books, 1981.

Corke, Hilary. "The Maggot and the Chinaman" Encounter Vol: 8, 1957, pp. 79-81.

Crawford, Paul. *Politics and History in William Golding, The World Turned Upside Down*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2002.

Crompton, Don. *A View from the Spire: William Golding's Later Novels.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1985.

Culler, Jonathan. "Story and Discourse in the Analysis of Narratives" in McQuillan, M. (Ed.) *The Narrative Reader*. London and NewYork: Routledge, 2000. pp. 104-108.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Canterbury Tales, A Selection*. London: Penguin Books, 1996.

Currie, Mark. *Postmodern Narrative* Theory. London: St.Martin Press, 1998.

Delbeare, Jeanne. *Golding: The Sound of Silence*. Brussels: Liege Language and Literature, 1991.

Dickens, Charles. *Great Expectations*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics, 2000.

Dickson, L. L. *The Modern Allegories of William Golding* (Tampa: University of South Caroline Press) 1990.

Emmott, Katherine. "Frames of Reference, Contextual Monitoring and the Interpretation of Narrative Discourse". *Narrative Theory, Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies*, Vol. 4. Ed. Mieke Bal. London and New York: Routledge, 2006. pp. 371-381.

Fielding, Henry. *Tom Jones*. London Penguin Books, 1994.

Forster, E. M. A Passage to India. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1979.

Fowler, Roger. *Linguistics and the Novel*. London and NewYork: Routledge, 1989.

Foucault, Michel. "What is an Author". *Authorship: from Plato to the Postmodern*. Ed. Burke, Séan. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, 1995. pp. 233-246.

Friedman, Lawrence S. *William Golding*. New York: Continuum Press, 1993.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism, Four Essays*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1973.

Genette, Gerard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation.*Trans. *J*. E. Lewin Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Gindin, James. *William Golding*. London: MacMillan, 1988.

Golding, William. *Lord of the Flies*. London: Faber and Faber, 1990.

---------*The Spire*. London: Faber and Faber, 1964.

---------*Darkness Visible*. London: Faber and Faber, 1980.

---------*The Pyramid*. London: Faber and Faber, 1969.

---------*The Paper Man.* London: Faber and Faber, 1984.

---------*Rites of Passage.* London: Faber and Faber, 1980.

---------*The Hot Gates* London: Faber and Faber, 1965.

Goldman, Alvin. *A Theory of Human Action*. New jersey: Prentice Hall, 1970.

Herrman, David. *Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Ed. D. Herman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Horatschek, Anna-M. "Alterity". *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. Eds. D. Herman, J. David J. and M. Jahn. New York: Routledge. 2005. pp.12-14.

Hynes, Samuel. "Moral Models". *Novels, 1954-1967, A Casebook*. Ed. Norman Page. London: Macmillan, 1987. pp. 97-100.

Hynes, Samuel. "On Pincher Martin". *Novels, 1954-1967, A Casebook*. Ed. Norman Page. London: Macmillan, 1987. pp. 125-134.

İçöz, N. *Golding'in Yapıtlarında İnsan ve Doğası*. Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları, 1992.

Jahn, Manfred. *Narratology: A Guide to the Theory of Narrative*. Cologne: University of Cologne, 2003.

Jahn, Manfred. "More Aspects of Focalization: Refinement and Applications

(Revue des Groupes de Recherces Anglo-Américaines)". Recent Trends in Narratological Research: Papers from the Narratology Round Table Ed. J. Pier. ESSE 4, September 1997, pp. 85-110.

Jahn, Manfred. "Focalization". The Cambridge Companion to Narrative. Ed. David Herman. 2008. pp. 94-108; and abridged in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. Eds. D. Herman, J. David J. and M. Jahn. New York: Routledge. 2005.
pp.173-177.

James, Henry. "Preface to Roderick Hudson". The Portable Henry James. Ed. John Auchard. New York: Penguin, 2004. pp. 469-475.

Johnson, B.R. "Golding's First Argument: Theme and Structure in Free Fall" *Critical Essays on William Golding*. Ed. James R. Baker. Boston: Boston Hall, 1988. pp. 61-72.

Joyce, James. *Ulysses*.Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1984.

----------*Portrait of the Artist As A Young Man*. London: Penguin Books, 1996.

Kermode, Frank. "William Golding's Intellectual Economy". *Novels, 1954-1967, A Casebook*. Ed. Norman Page. London: Macmillan, 1987. pp. 50-65.

Kinkead- Weekes, Mark. "The Visual and the Visionary in Golding". William Golding, *The Man and His Books, A Tribute on his 75th Birthday*. Ed. Carey, John. London: Faber and Faber, 1986. pp. 64-83.

Kinkead-Weekes, Mark and Gregor Ian. *William Golding, A Critical Study*. London: Faber and Faber, 1967.

Lawrence, D.H. *Sons and Lovers*. New York: Penguin Classics, 1994.

Lanser, Susan S. "(Im)plying the Author". *Narrative Theeory, Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies*, Vol. 2. Ed. Mieke Bal. London and New York: Routledge, 2006. pp. 11-17.

Lodge, David. *Language of Fiction*. Lundon: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

Monod, S. "Golding's View of the Human Condition in *Free Fall*". *Novels, 1954-1967, A Casebook*. Ed. Norman Page. London: Macmillan, 1987. pp. 125-132.

Mendilow, A. A. *Time and The Novel*. Deventer: Peter Nevill and Ysel Press, 1952.

Mcquillan, Martin (Ed.).*The Narrative Reader*. London and New York: Routledge,
2000.

Oldsey, Bernard S. and Weintraub, Stanley. *The Art of William Golding*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968.

Page, Norman. "Golding's Sources". *Novels, 1954-1967, A Casebook* Ed. N. Page. London: Macmillan, 1987, pp. 101-114.

Peck, John and Coyle, Martin. Literary Terms and Criticism. Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002.

Peter J. "The Fables of William Golding". *Novels, 1954- 1967, A Casebook* Ed. N. Page. London: Macmillan, 1987, pp. 33-45.

Phelan, James. "Narrative Discourse, Literary Character, and Ideology" in *Compiled Essays: Reading Narrative, Form, Ethics,Ideology*. Ed. J. Phelan. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1989.

Phelan, J. and Rabinowitz P. *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

Plato. *The Republic*. Trans. and Ed. H. D. P. Lee. London : Penguin, 1955.

Prince, Gerald. "On Narratology (Past, Present, Future)". *The Narrative Reader*. Ed. M. McQuillan. London and NewYork: Routledge, 2000.

Proust, Marcel. Swann's Way. London: Penguin Books, 2004.

Ray, William. *Literary Meaning from Phenomenology to Deconstruction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.

Redpath, Philip. *Golding: A Structural Reading of his Fiction*. London: Vision and Barnes and Noble, 1984.

Redpath, Philip. "Dogs Would Find an Arid Space round My Feet: A Humanist Reading of the Inheritors". *Critical Essays on William Golding*. Ed. James R. Baker. Boston: Boston Hall, 1988. pp. 32-41.

Richter, David. (Ed.) *The Critical Tradition*. Two Volumes.New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.

Salinger, J. D. The Catcher in the Rye. London and New York, 1994.

Selden, R., Widdowson, P. and Broker P. *Contemporary Literary Theory*.

London: Prentice Hall, 1997.

Simpson, Paul. *Language Ideology and Point of View*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

Sonmez, Margaret. "Communication in *The Inheritors*" in *William Golding and His Work*, Conference Proceeding. Ankara: British Council and METU, 1995 [1994].

Stern, Laurence. *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics, 1996.

Surette, Leon. "A Matter of Belief, Pincher martin's Afterlife". Twentieth Century Literature Vol. 40, No. 2 , Summer, 1994. pp. 205-225.

Tambling, Jeremy. *What is Literary Language?* . Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1988.

Tiger, Virginia. *The Dark Field of Discovery*. London: Calder and Boyars, 1974.

Weber, Samuel. *Institution and Interpretation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.

Wordsworth, William. The Major Works. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Whitehead, Lee M. "The Moment out of Time: Golding's *Pincher Martin*." *Critical Essays on William Golding*. Ed. James R.Baker. Boston: Boston Hall, 1988. pp. 41-60.

Woolf, Virginia. *To the Lighthouse*. London: Penguin Books, 1996.

----------*Mrs. Dalloway*. London: Penguin Books, 1996.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. London and New York: Routledge and K. Paul, 1988. pp.68-69.

TURKISH SUMMARY

William Golding'in romanları bugüne kadar çeşitli tematik ve yapısal açıdan incelenmiş, ancak anlatım stratejileri ve teknik açısından başlıbaşına anlatıbilimsel bir çalışma ortaya konmamıştır. Genette, bugüne kadar eleştirmenlerin anlatı metinlerini yorumlamaya çalıştıklarını, ancak üretilen anlamların altında yatan somut araç ve stratejilere dikkate edilmediğini belirtir. İşte bu tez, Golding'in üç romanını mevcut yorumları göz ardı etmeksizin, ilk kez bu açıdan yeniden okuyor. Golding'in basmakalıp mesaj kaygısı güden romanların aksine çeşitlilik, şaşırtıcılık, karmaşıklık ve ucu açıklık özelliklerine sahip bu üç romanındaki anlatıbilimsel öğeleri ortaya çıkarıp onları mevcut yorumlara bağlamayı, ve soyut yorumların altını somut stratejilerle doldurmayı hedefliyor.

Bu tez, analizlerinde Genette ve Rimmon-Kenan'ın geliştirdikleri terminolojiyi kullanmaktadır. Buna göre, bu çalışmanın özellikle anlatıcı etrafında toplanmış anlatı strateji, araç ve öğeleri irdelemekte olduğu söylenebilir. Bunlardan başlıcaları anlatıcıyla doğrudan ilişkili "anlatıcı ses" (voice) ve odaklama (fokalizasyon) ile doğrudan ilişkili "anlatı modu"(mood)'dur. Bunların farklı biçimlerde kullanılması sayesinde anlatı içindeki anlatı düzeyleri, hareketli görüngeler (perspektif) yaratan farklı odaklama düzeyleri ortaya çıkar. Bunların ileri ya da geri kronoloji kırılmalarına, yavaşlama, hızlanma ya da sahneleme gibi çeşitli zamansal organizasyonlara olanak sağladığı da görülür. Bu anlatı araç ve stratejileri, anlatı metninde içkin, anlatı kurgusunun bizzat kendisi tarafından telkin edilen "varsayılan yazar" (implied author) tarafından belli anlam ya da anlamlar üretmek, belli iletileri okura ulaştırmak, anlamı etkilemek, değiştirmek ya da belirlemek için kullanıldığı açıktır. Bu tez, bahsi geçen strateji ve tekniklerle, varsayılan yazarın *Mirasçılar*'da öteki sorunsalını irdelemek için

odaklama tekniğini nasıl kullandığını, *Pincher Martin*'de ölüm sonrası bilinç/bilinçdışını yansıtmak için anlatı düzeyleri ve odaklama yöntemi aracılığıyla zaman kavramını nasıl manipüle ettiğini, ve *Serbest Düşme*'de anlatıcı karakterin anlatı düzeylerinin manipülasyonu ve farklı odaklama düzeyleri ile geçmişi araştırırken kimliğini yeniden inşa edişi gösterilmektedir.

Friedman'ın dediği gibi, William Golding ahlaksal kaygılar güden bir yazardır. Buradan onun ahlakçı olduğu anlamını çıkarmamak gerekir. Bu tezin konu aldığı üç roman onun bu kaygısını ortaya koyduğu kadar, alışılmış ahlakçı yargıları altüst ederek, gerçeğin kolayca ele geçirilebilecek bir şey olmadığını da gösterir. Golding, daima insanın insana dair bilgisinin ve insanın diğer insanlar insan ve kendi benliği karşısındaki gücünün sınırlarına işaret eder. Aslında *Sineklerin Tanrısı*'na ek olarak, bu tezin konusunu oluşturan üç romanında yani *Mirasçılar, Pincher Martin* ve *Serbest Düşme* insanın derinliklerinde yatan karanlığı ve kötülük eğilimini irdelemeye çalışmıştır.

Ele alınan üç romanda anlatıcı ve odaklayıcı unsurların en az anlam kadar önemli olduğu, tekniğin kimi zaman mesajın önüne geçerek okuru etkilediği görülür. Özellikle odaklama ve görünge oyunları (perspectivization), bu üç romanda diğerlerine nispetle daha belirgindir. Anlatı çizgisi doğrusal değildir, kronoloji bozulmuştur, olaylar, algılamalar, düşünceler farklı görüngelerden aktarılır, anlatıcı ses kadar izleyici göz / algılayıcı zihin etkin öğelerdir. Anlatıların sunduğu alegoriler kapalı değildir. Toplumsal sorunlardan çok bireyin iç dünyasına ışık tutulmaya çalışılmakta, bu da daha karmaşık bir tekniğe kapı aralanmaktadır.

Golding'in karakterlerinin genellikle bir oluş (becoming) süreci içinde olduğu görülür. Bu süreç onların bilinç düzeylerinin gittikçe yükselmesi ile kendini gösterir. Karakterlerdeki değişimi farklı açı ve görüngelerden çarpıcı biçimde yansıtmak ve okuru bu değişimin adeta bir parçası haline getirerek çift katmanlı bir okuma serüveninin içine çekebilmek Golding anlatılarının başarısıdır. Yine Friedman'a göre, bu karakterler ruhsal çalkantıları olan, ahlaksal ya da varoluşsal konularla bir şekilde ilintili karakterlerdir. Bunu dışavuran en

önemli özelliklerinden biri acı çekebilme kabiliyetleridir. Tabii, bunun sebebi bu karakterlerin kendi iç dünyalarına, benliklerine yönelmiş olmalarıdır. Bu sebeple, Golding'in karakterlerini çözümlerken onları meşgul eden sorunsalın rasyonel olmayan bir özellik sergilediği dikkate alınmalıdır. Okur bu karakterlerle varoluşun rasyonel sınırlarını aşan bir düzlemde karşılaşır. Nitekim Golding'in kendisi *The Hot Gates*'de bu duruma değinir ve kendisinin insanlık durumunu irdeleyen, insanın rasyonel sınırları aşan ahlaksal ve ruhsal yanlarını araştıran bir fabl yazarı olduğunu söyler. Ona göre bir yazar, bir hikaye anlatıyorsa vermek istediği bir ders vardır. Fakat, der, elbette ki bu ders yazarın tekniği sayesinde gizlenecek, hikayenin ve olay örgüsünün içinde eritilecektir. Hynes, Golding'in bu tespitlerini doğrularcasına, onun romanlarındaki bu anlam üretme çabasının altını çizer. Bu durum bize, bir yazar olarak Golding'in romanlarında anlatı araç ve stratejilerini oldukça etkin ve çarpıcı biçimde kullanışının ipuçlarını verir. Dolayısıyla hikaye anlatma tekniği Golding için salt bir araç olmanın ötesinde, yer yer anlamın önüne geçen bir unsur olmuştur. Bunu, Golding'in ahlaksal konularla ilgilenen fakat asla ahlakçı olmayan bir yazar olmasına bağlamak mantıklıdır. Bu açıdan bakıldığında romanlarından yola çıkarak, şu söylenebilir: Aslında Golding için hikaye anlatmak, öykü kurgulamak, insanı araştırmanın bir yöntemidir ve okuru kapalı mesajlarla buluşturmaktan çok, ucu açık sorgulama ve anlamlara taşır.

Golding'in romanlarında anlam ile anlatım tekniği arasında sıkı bir ilişki göze çarpar. Bu çalışmamızda, bu ilişkiyi araştırmak için kullandığımız yöntem anlatıbilimsel (narratologic) okuma yöntemidir. Genette, *Narrative Discourse Revisited*'da bu tarz okumayı pratik (practical) okuma olarak nitelendirir. Buna göre, bir anlatıyı oluşturan somut yapıların ayırdında olmak okumayı zenginleştirecek, okur ayrıca anlatı metinlerinin, anlatı söylemlerinin ya da anlatı kurgularının doğasına ilişkin daha da bilinçlenerek, anlamı oluşturan tasarım hakkında bilgi sahibi olacaktır. Bu bilinçlenme ve bilgilenme, metnin gerektiğinde eleştiriye tabi tutulmasının da önünü açacak, okurda yaratılan gerçeklik algısı ve gerçeğe özdeşlik yanılsaması kırılabilecektir.

Bir 20. yy. olgusu olarak anlatıbilim (narratology), gerek Rus biçimciliğinin, gerek Yeni eleştiri, Chicago okulu ve diğer yapısalcı/post-yapısalcı anlatıbilim ekollerinin ilgi odağı olmuştur. Henry James, Wayne Booth, Mikhail Bakhtin, Gerard Genette gibi alanın önde gelenleri önemli sorular gündeme getirmekle kalmamış, kendi terminolojilerini geliştirmeye çelışmışlardır. Henry James'in belirttiği gibi bir anlatı söylemi içinde ilişkiler sonsuzdur ve yazarın görevi bu ilişkileri kendine has yöntemlerle belli bir kalıba sokmaya çalışmaktır. Nitekim, Wayne Booth, *Rhetoric of Fiction*'da retorikten kaçması diye bir şey söz konusu olamaz. Yazarın asıl ve asal sorunu nasıl bir retorik kullanacağı üzerinde kafa yormaktır. Bu da, anlatım tekniğinin anlatıyı oluşturan önemli bir unsur olduğunu eleştirmene hatırlatır. Booth'a göre anlatı stratejileri yazarın bilinçli seçimlerinin bir sonucudur ve belli bir amaca hizmet eder. Booth, bu seçimlerin, anlatı metinlerinde diğer metinlere oranla daha önemli ve belirgin olduğunu altını çizer. Booth ayrıca, yazar-anlatıcı-okur üçlemesine ilişkin olarak "varsayılan yazar" (implied author) terimini geliştirmiştir. Genette ise bütüncül bir anlatıbilimsel okumayı mümkün kılan ilk kişidir. Geliştirdiği teknik terminoloji hemen bütün anlatı metinlerine uygulanabilecek niteliktedir. Anlatıcıyı gramatik bir kişi zamirinin ötesinde anlatı işlevselliği içinde ele alan Genette, büyük bir devrim yaparak anlatı söylemi analizine "odaklama" (focalization) kavramını getiren ve bunu Proust'a uygulayan kuramcıdır.

Bu tez, şu ana kadar söylenenlerden anlaşılacağı üzere, anlatısal metinlerle ilgilenir. Bu nedenle, öncelikle öykünme / benzetme (mimesis) ile anlatım / öyküleme (diegesis) arasındaki ayrıma vurgu yapar. Anlatılarda bir gerçeğin yansıtıldığına dair bir yanılsama yaratıldığı hatırlatılatılarak, yapılanın bir öykünme ya da benzetme değil öyküleme ya da hikaye anlatımı olduğunun altı çizilir. Nitekim, Genette anlatılarda klasik anlamda bir benzetme ya da temsilin (representation) imkansızlığı üzerinde durmuştur. Genette'e göre, geleneksel "gösterme / anlatma" (showing / telling) ayrımını yadsır. Bilindiği gibi bu düşünce, Plato'nun *Devlet*'indeki şair / anlatı ile karakter / dramatik temsil arasındaki ayrıma dayanır. Oysa Genette'e göre bizzat "temsil" fikri tamamıyla yanılsamadan ibarettir. Bu yaklaşımını Barthes'ın "gerçeklik etkisi" (l'effet de

réel) kavramına gönderme yaparak açıklayan Genette, aynı bağlamda "öykünme / benzetme etkisi" (mimetic effect) kavramı üzerinde durur. Oysa anlatılarda ortaya çıkan bütün bu tür yanılsamalardan başta varsayılan yazar olmak üzere, anlatı temsilcileri (narrative agent) yani anlatıcı ve odaklayıcı unsurlar sorumludur. Bu unsurlar analiz edildiğinde, gerçeklik ve temsil yanılsamasının nasıl yaratıldığı ve anlatının ne tür oyunlarla dolu olduğu görülür. Bu oyunlar sayesinde olay, karakter ve zaman algısı çeşitlendirilerek, sadece anlam üretme kaygısıyla sınırlı kalınmadığı, okuru anlatıya bağlayacak estetik amaçların güdüldüğü gözlenir. Bütün bunların ne tür seçme, eleme, çarpıtma, erteleme, çeşitlendirmeler ile gerçekleştirildiği dikkatli bir okurun gözünden kaçmayacaktır.

Anlatıcı'nın anlatıya ve öyküye nispetle konumu anlatı düzeyleri ile yakından ilgilidir. Buna göre anlatıcılar anlatı dışı / anlatı içi (extradiegetic / intradiegetic) ve öykü dışı / öykü içi (heterodiegetic / homodiegetic) olarak sınıflandırılabilirler. Anlatı ve öykü dışı bir anlatıcının varlığı kendini öyküyü anlatan ses olarak belli eder. Klasik anlatılarda anlatıcıların genel özelliği dışarıdan bir ses olarak anlattıkları dünyaya dışarıdan bakmalarıdır. Üçüncü şahıs anlatıcılar gibi birinci şahıs anlatıcılar da anlatı dışı anlatıcı olabilir. Bu tür durumlarda anlatıcı genellikle kendisini bir karakter olarak ele alır ve kendisiyle arasına mesafe koyar. Özellikle özgeçmişini araştıran bir anlatıcının durumu buna uygundur. Öykünün içindedir çünkü anlatılan onun öyküsüdür fakat anlatının dışındadır çünkü öyküdeki dünyanın artık dışında yer almaktadır, deyim yerindeyse dışarıdan bir gözlemci olarak olayları anlatmaktadır. Anlatıcıya ilişkin bu sınıflandırma, anlatı yapısının hiyerarşik niteliğine de işaret eder. Bir örnek vermek gerekirse, *Karanlığın Kalbi* (*Heart of Darkness*)'nde anlatıcı Marlow gemidekilere başından geçenleri anlattığı sırada anlattığı öykünün bir karakter olarak içinde olmasına rağmen anlatısal açıdan dışında yer almakta, o dünyaya artık dışarıdan bakmaktadır. Bu çalışmada ele alınan romanlardaki anlatıcılar bu bakımdan çeşitli özellikler gösterir ve bu sayede farklı anlatı düzeyleri oluştururlar. *Pincher Martin* ve *Serbest Düşme*'de olduğu gibi, öykü içinde öyküler anlatılabilir ve bu kombinasyonlar anlamı doğrudan ya da dolaylı olarak etkileyen bir nitelik sergiler. Aynı ana anlatı içinde üretilen alt anlatılar, ana

çerçeve ile çelişebilir, onu destekleyebilir, manipüle edebilir, tehdit edebilir. Okurun kafası anlatıcının güvenilir olup olmadığı sorusuyla karıştırılabilir. Bu ve benzer anlatıcı / anlatı düzeyi özellikleri, varsayılan yazarın anlatı üzerindeki otoritesine işaret eder. Anlatıcının sesi ve konumu bu otoriteyi sağlayan / sağlamlaştıran temel bir öğedir. Metinler için söz konusu olan yazar otoritesi (author-ity) anlatı metinlerinde kendini anlatıcı ses ile dışavurur.

Odaklama ise, anlatının görüş/algılayış/düşünüş çizgisine yön veren görüngeleri dışlaştırmaya yarayan hayati bir olgudur ve anlatıcı sesi bütünleyen anlatı modunun ne olduğunu anlamamıza yarar. Bir olayın ya da nesnenin kimin sesinden anlatıldığı kadar kimin gözünden/zihninden aktarıldığı da önemlidir. Mieke Bal'a göre anlatıcı ses ve anlatım, anlatının teknik yönüne daha çok hizmet ederken, odaklama ve görünge, anlatının ideolojik unsurlarını teşkil eder. Mieke Bal, bunu, teknik anlatıcı / ideolojik anlatıcı ayrımıyla dile getirir. Anlatım anlatının teknik yönüyle, odaklama yapması ise daha çok anlatının ideolojik boyutuyla ilgilidir. Çünkü, odaklama, beş duyu organı vasıtasıyla elde edilen algıları aktarmakla kalmaz, zihinsel karmaşaları, bilinç akışını, rüya, halüsinasyon ve yanılsamaları, düşünceleri de yansıtır. Böylece okur odaklayıcı unsurun (bu anlatıcının bizzat kendisi ya da bir karakter olabilir) iç dünyası, psikolojik durumu, hayal gücü ve zihin yapısına nüfuz edebilir. Buna göre, anlatımın yarattığı otoriteye ek olarak odaklama söz konusu olduğunda monitorite (monitor-ity)'den bahsetmek gerekir.

Monitorite (monitor-ity) anlatıbilimsel bağlamda ilk olarak bu tezde kullanılan özgün bir terimdir. Foucault ("author-ity"), Goldman ("monitoring") ve Emmott ("monitor frame")'dan hareketle üretilen bu kavram, anlatısal metinlerin sadece otorite değil, monitorite de ürettiği, ancak bu monitorite'nin anlatıcı unsur ile karakterler arasında hareketli bir yapıya sahip olduğu, zaman zaman anlatıcı otoriteyi sarstığı hatta onu tersyüz ettiğini savunmaktadır. Bir başka deyişle, elimizdeki metin bir anlatı metniyse dikkatli okur için yazar ve anlatıcı otoritesinin monitorite ile ne ölçüde desteklendiği ya da sarsıldığı ayrı bir ilgi alanı olmalıdır. Golding'in romanlarında karakterlerin görme, algılama ve zihinsel aktarımından kaynaklanan monitorite, anlatıcı sesin otoritesini önemli ölçüde

sarsan ve dengeleyen bir öğe olarak karşımıza çıkar. Hakim ses, alternatif görüngelerle zenginleştirilir.

Üçüncü bölüm'de *Mirasçılar* romanı ele alınmaktadır. Bu roman özellikle görünge (perspective) ile oynamakta, karakterlerin bakış açısını, zihinsel ve bilişsel durumunu yansıtmak amacıyla odaklama tekniğini etkin ve manipülatif biçimde kullanmaktadır. Bu bölümde Genette terminolojisinden yararlanarak anlatıcı ve odaklayıcılar tespit edilmekte, onların nitelikleri üzerinde durulmaktadır. Ayrıca metin okumaları yapılarak anlatım ve odaklamanın ayrıştığı söylem özellikleri gösterilmektedir. Bu okumalar karakterlerin (Lok, Fa, Vivani) bilinç değişimini de ortaya koyması bakımından ilginçtir. Son olarak, elde edilen bulgularla roman etik açıdan yeniden okunmaya çalışılmaktadır.

Mirasçılar buzul çağının sonlarına doğru büyük bir orman yangınından kurtulmuş sekiz kişilik son Neandertal grubunun yok olma öyküsünü anlatır. Bu küçük kabileye hasta ve yaşlı Mal ile karısı Yaşlı Kadın liderlik etmektedir. Kabilenin erkekleri Lok ve Ha, kadınları ise Fa ve Nil'dir. Komün halinde yaşayan bu grubun çocuk üyeleri romanın sonunda Homo sapiens tarafından öldürülecek olan küçük kız Liku ile Nil'in daha yeni emeklemeye başlamış bebeğidir. Roman, duyu organlarına bağımlı, entelektüel kapasitesi ve dili sınırlı, duygularıyla yaşayan ve içerden bir gözle bakıldığında sevgi dolu bu kabile üyelerinin Homo sapiens tarafından tek tek yok edilişini konu alır.

Mirasçılar, eğer ilk başta verilen H. G. Wells'in *The Outline of History* adlı yapıtından alınan epigrafı saymazsak, alt anlatılar içermeyen birinci derece bir anlatıdır. Zamansal organizasyon açısından bakıldığında, kronoloji ile oynanmamıştır. Ancak, bu görece basit tekil ve doğrusal anlatı düzeyi hareketli odaklamalarla karmaşık hale getirilmiştir. Anlatıcı üçüncü tekil şahıs anlatı ve öykü dışı bir anlatıcıdır. Dolayısıyla ilk bakışta anlatısal bağlamda otoriter bir özellik sergilemesi beklenir. Ancak anlatıcının görünürdeki hakim otoritesi odaklamalarla sınırlandırılmıştır. Anlatı üç bölüme ayrılabilir. Bunlar, Neandertal insanın (Lok) görüş açısından aktarılan, insan penceresinden anlatılan (yazar) ve Homo sapiens'in (Tuami) görüş açısından aktarılan bölümlerdir.

Epigraf, kendi başına bir anlatı düzeyi ortaya koymamakla birlikte, Neandertal insanını yamyamca dürtüleri olan canavar ("ogre / monster") olarak tanıttığı için, daha başından itibaren okur için bir okuma katmanı görevi görür. Dolayısıyla, anlatının kritik önemde bir parçasıdır fakat anlatım'ın bir parçası değildir. Daha önce de işaret edildiği üzere, romanda başka bir alt anlatı düzeyine de rastlanmaz. Muhtemel anlatısal çelişki ya da ayrım (gap) anlatı düzeyleri arasında değil öncelikle epigraf ile ana anlatı arasında doğar.

Fakat asıl çelişki ve ayrımlar odaklama düzeyleri arasındadır. Varsayılan yazar, başından itibaren öykünün önemli bir kısmını Neandertal insanın penceresinden ve görüş açısından aktarır. Duyulan okurla aynı entelektüel seviyedeki gelişmiş bir dile sahip yazarın sesidir fakat aktarım Neandertal insanın zihinsel, duygusal ve duyusal nitelikleriyle belirlenmiştir. Özellikle zamansal hızlanma ya da yavaşlamaya başvurulmadığı sahnelerde yazar, Neandertal insanın naif doğasını oldukça başarılı resmeder. Bu insanlar, içinde bulundukları durumu ve karşılaştıkları tehlikeyi sezmiş olmakla birlikte anlamlandırmaktan ve ona karşı bir çözüm üretmekten uzak görünürler.

Her ne kadar anlatıcı anlatı dışı ve öykü dışı olsa da, hikâyenin aktarımı oldukça içerdendir. Bu sahnelerde anlatıcı herhangi bir önyargı ortaya koymaksızın olabildiğince Neandertal insanın algı, kavrayış ve duyumlarını aktarmaya çalışır. Böylece okur bu sahneler yardımıyla Neandertal insanı farklı bir gözle, içerden bir bakışla kitaplarda anlatılandan daha farklı bir biçimde yeniden tanımaya başlar. Olayların anlatım seyri içinde, Neandertal insanı temsil eden Lok'un da kendini tanımaya başladığı görülür. Romanın başlarındaki saflığı ve amaçsız neşesini korkuyla karışık bir merak ve endişe duygusu alacaktır.

Wittgenstein'ın *Tractatus*'unda ortaya koyduğu gibi, dilimizin sınırları dünyamızın sınırlarıdır bir bakıma. Bu romanda odaklama yöntemiyle yaratılan farklı görüş açıları ortaya çıkan dil farklılıklarıyla kendini gösterir. Daha önce belirtildiği gibi, Neandertal insanın kullandığı dil, yazarın dili ve Homo sapiens'in dili farklılıklar gösterirken aynı zamanda onların algı, kavrayış ve duyuş biçimlerine de ışık tutar. Neandertallerin kullandığı dil oldukça basit dizgesi olan,

sınırlı sayıda sözcük içeren, soyut kavramları bulunmayan, duyular tarafından toplanmış bilgilerin resme aktarılmış imgeleriyle oluşmuş, bu sebeple başat özelliği resimsellik olan bir dildir. Örneğin, bu dil ve kavrayış dünyası içinde yeni insanlar dedikleri Homo sapiens'in kullandığı bir kano içi oyulmuş bir kütükten ibarettir. Korku bile onlar için bir resimdir, mesela bir sırtlan resmi. Ya da kokuların bile bir rengi vardır Neandertal dünyasında. Eriyen buzulları görür ama bir çağın sonuna geldiklerini anlayamazlar. Dilleri böyle olduğu içindir ki, gelişmiş alet yapma yetisinden de yoksundurlar. Yazar'ın farklılığı deyim yerindeyse Neandertal insanı kameranın başından kaldırdığında ortaya çıkar. Bu anlarda anlatının görece yavaşladığına tanık oluruz. Okur, sahne aralarında, oldukça şiirsel bir dille ayrıntılı ve uzun doğa tasvirleri yapanın yazar olduğunu daha başta dildeki çarpıcı değişimden anlar. Bu kısımlar okur için farklı olasılıklara işarettir aynı zamanda. Bir yandan Nenadertal insanın Wells'in tarif ettiği gibi bir canavar olmadığını görüp onunla özdeşleşmeye ve empati kurmaya başlarken, sadece ses olarak değil, görüş açısı olarak yazar'ı dinlediğinde, Neandertal insanla özdeşleşmenin güçlüğünü yaşar. En azından, Neandertal insanın kendisi gibi olmadığını, kendisinden farklı olduğunu da hatırlar. Redpath, bu nedenle, duyulan şeyin empatiden ziyade baskın acıma duygusu olduğunda ısrar eder. Nitekim, yazar 11. bölümün ortalarında bakışını doğrudan Neandertal insana yönelttiğinde, okur o ana kadar dolaylı yoldan işaret edilen gerçekle karşılaşır: Yazar'ın gözünden de Neandertal insanı kızıl bir yaratıktır ne yazık ki. Köpek dişleri çıkmış, kolları nerdeyse yere değen, burun kanatları kocaman bir yaratıktır. Bu betimleme, o ana kadar tarafsızlığını göstermiş olan yazarın gördüğü ne ise onun aktarımıdır. Homo sapiens'in görüş açısından ise, Neandertal insanı kızıl bir şeytandır. Okur, Homo sapiens'in diline / dünyasına girdikçe onun daha gelişmiş bir entelektüel donanıma sahip olduğunu ve alet yaparak yeni koşullara adapte olma yeteneğini görür. Okur ayrıca Homo sapiens'in Neandertal insan'dan korktuğunu da anlar. Korku, bütün insanlarda var olan, yatıştırılmak / tedavi edilmek kadar anlaşılmayı da hak eden bir olgudur.

Mirasçılar'ı özgün kılan şey, Wells'in canavarına Wells ile aynı oranda bir anlatı statüsü sağlaması, "öteki" ilan edilenin görüngesinden bakarak sorunun

içerden bir gözle değerlendirilebilmesine zemin hazırlamasıdır. Neandertal insanını içerden kavrayınca, okur romanın sonunda her ne kadar onunla tam özdeşleşmekte zorlansa da, ötekini anlama konusunda önemli bir deneyim yaşamış olacaktır. Bu nedenle, *Mirasçılar*, ahlakçılığa ve ayrımcılığa karşı etik okumaya fırsat tanıyan bir yapıttır. Peck ve Coyle'a göre ırkçı ve ayrımcı tutumların dayandığı temel kavramlar "öteki" (other) ve "yabancı" (outsider) kavramlarıdır. Bir kez bu şekilde düşünmeye başlayınca, ikili karşıtlıkların tuzağına düşülür ve insan doğasında içkin korkuların da devreye girmesiyle kontrol edilemeyen sorunlar ortaya çıkabilir. *Mirasçılar*, bizzat anlatım tekniğini kullanarak bu ikili karşıtlık sarmalını yıkan bir anlatı yaratır. Nitekim, romanda Lok için Tuami öteki'dir, Tuami için Lok şeytandır/ yabancıdır. Böylece "öteki" kavramının göreceli olduğu da vurgulanmış olur. Vermeye çalıştığı ders, belli bir öğüt içermez, aksine daima farklı pencerelerden bakmanın mümkünlüğünün altını çizerek etiği tanımlanmış söylemlerden kurtararak, onun öncelikle bir tutum olduğuna vurgu yapar. Neyin doğru neyin yanlış olduğunu söylemeye değil, anlama ve farklı açılardan görmeye odaklanır. Dolayısıyla *Mirasçılar*'da Homo sapiens salt kötülüğün simgesi olarak görülemez.

Sonuç olarak, *Mirasçılar*, olayları öncelikle farklı ötekilerin farklı görüngelerinden aktaran, bilim ve antropolojinin epigrafta da ifadesini bulan mevcut "öteki" kavramını sorgulayan bir romandır. İronik biçimde, Neandertal insanın gözünden Homo sapiens izlenir ve "öteki" olarak görülür. Bu tezin de ortaya koyduğu gibi, anlatı ve odaklama kategorileri özellikle karmaşıklaştırılmış ve bu sayede mevcut ikili karşıtlıklarla oynanmıştır. İçerden odaklandığında, Wells'in canavar öteki'si hassas, duygusal, naif bir varlıktır. Bu yönleriyle sempati, empati ve özdeşlik kurulması mümkün görünür. Görüş açısı değiştiğinde ise bu kez entelektüel kapasitesi ve korkularıyla Homo sapiens için aynı hisleri duymak mümkündür. Anlatım tekniği sayesinde, iyi/kötü, ben/öteki, gelişmiş/ilkel gibi karşıtlıklar sarsılır ve sorgulanır. Romanın sonunda Tuami'nin cinayetten vazgeçmesi, Vivani'nin Neandertal bebeği emzirmesi sırasında yaşananların odaklama yöntemiyle aktarılması sayesinde hem korkuları, hem insanın içindeki

iyilik potansiyelini hem de öteki ile bağ kurmanın mümkün oluşuna dair önemli işaretler alırız.

Pincher Martin, öldüğünü anlamayan ya da ölüm fikrini reddederek ona karşı zihinsel bir savaşım veren birinin öyküsüdür. Bu romanı konu alan dördüncü bölümde, varsayılan yazarın zamansallık ve zamandışılık ile nasıl oynamaya çalıştığı, ve bilinç ya da bilinçdışı deneyimin nasıl aktarıldığı üzerinde durulur. Yine ilk olarak Genette terminolojisi kullanılarak anlatı araç ve stratejileri incelendiğinde, bu romanın gerek anlatı düzeyleri, gerek odaklama düzeyleri gerekse zamansal organizasyonlar açısından oldukça karmaşık bir yapı sergilediği görülür. Bu karmaşıklığın, zamandışı bir boyutta yok olmaya direnen bilincin mücadelesini yansıtmak için özellikle yaratıldığı görülür. Bütün bunlar karakterin bugün ile geçmiş, hayal ile gerçek arasındaki gel-gitleriyle birleşir. Bu bölümde ayrıca romanın sonunda bütün bir anlatıyı adeta karakterin ölüm anına yani ta ilk sayfalara geri döndüren, alt anlatıları yalanlayan ve okunmuş olanların aslında bir ölünün deyim yerindeyse son sayıklamaları olduğunun ima edildiği ve böylece anlatının bizzat öykü anlatma sanatı (story-telling) ile de oynadığı görülür.

Pincher Martin, II. Dünya savaşı yıllarında hemen hemen bütün toplumsal bağlantılardan kopuk tam bir izolasyon içindeki bir kaya parçası üzerinde geçer. Bununla birlikte, alt anlatılar karakterin geçmişine uzanır ve başka karakter ve ortamlarla ancak bu alt anlatılarda karşılaşırız. Atlantiğin ortasında, torpillenen bir gemiden düşen kahraman, suyla boğuşma halinde iken okurla buluşur. Oraya nasıl düştüğü daha sonra zamansal geri dönüşlerin olduğu alt anlatılarla anlaşılacaktır. Dolayısıyla ilk bakışta kahramanın hem fiziksel hem de varoluşsal bir mücadele sürdürdüğü söylenebilir. Alt anlatılarla gittikçe belirginleşen geçmişiyle birlikte Martin'in geçmiş günahlarıyla da bir hesaplaşma içinde olduğu görülür. Roman ilerledikçe, alt anlatı ve değişen odaklamalar sayesinde, bir yandan Martin'in kaya yarığı içinde sıkışmış ve gittikçe bedenden sıyrılıp salt bir bilince indirgenen varlığının yok olmamak için verdiği sözde fiziksel çabaya, bir yandan varoluşunu duyumsamak ve kendini yaşadığına inandırmak adına ortaya koyduğu entelektüel mücadeleye, öte yandan da ortaya çıkan günahları karşısında Tanrı ve onun merhametine sığınmayı reddeden bilinç isyanına tanık oluruz. Bu kaya parçası

üzerinde mesleğinin aslında aktörlük olduğu sonradan anlaşılan Martin ölüme karşı son oyununu oynamaktadır. Nitekim Golding kendi yarattığı karakter hakkında onun pasif bir şekilde öylece ölmeyi kabullenemediğini belirtir. Ölmüş cesedi Atlantiğin sularında karaya vuracağı noktaya doğru yuvarlanıp giderken, Martin ruhsal ve zihinsel olarak bu gerçeklikten kopuk başka bir gerçeklik inşasına kalkışmış, ve romanın ilk birkaç sayfası ile son birkaç sayfası dışındaki anlatılar ortaya çıkmıştır.

Lakabından (pincher: eli uzun, hırsız) da anlaşılacağı üzere, Martin başkalarından çalmayı alışkanlık haline getirmiş, özü itibariyle bencil bir karakterdir. Alt anlatılar sayesinde, Martin'in arkadaşı Pete'in karısını ayartmaya uğraştığı, yine bir başka arkadaşı Alfred'in kız arkadaşı Sybil ile birlikte olmaya çalıştığı, yakın arkadaşı Nathaniel'in kız arkadaşı masum Mary'yi taciz ettiği ve birlikte olmaya zorladığı, ve yine bir motor yarışında hırsına kapılarak arkadaşı Pete'in sakat kalmasına sebep olduğu öğrenilir. Bütün bunlardan Martin'in etrafındaki insanları farklı biçimlerde insanların yaşamlarından değerli varlıkları çalmaya kalkıştığı anlaşılır. Nitekim, kendisinin okyanusa düşmesi yine arkadaşı Nathaniel'i öldürmeye çalışırken dümeni kırmaya çalışırken olmuştur. Dickson, onun asıl kaygısının bedensel olarak hayatta kalma mücadelesinden çok, karakter ve kimliğini kaybetmeme mücadelesi verdiğini söyler. Böylece kendi hayali dünyasını yaratan Martin, adeta Tanrı rolüne soyunarak, ölüme ve Tanrı'ya meydan okur. İnançsız bir kişi olan Martin için varsayılan yazar adeta bir çilehane hazırlamış, bu çilehanenin tuğlalarını bizzat Martin'e ördürmüştür. Penceresinden geçmişin günahlarının seyredildiği bu çilehane, Tanrı inancı olmayan martin için, dinsel bir arınma mekanı değildir elbet. Doğası gereği materyal bir niteliğe sahip bu çilehanede yaşadıklarını ve geçmişe yönelik hatırladığı sahneleri onun gözünden, onun zihninden, onun hislerinden izleme fırsatı buluruz. Dolayısıyla burası, Martin'in ölüm ile yaşam arasında kalmış zamandışı bir alemde yaşadığı deneyimlerinin mekanıdır.

Pincher Martin'i görece diğer romanlardan zor kılan yanı, ikinci hatta üçüncü derece alt anlatılar içermesi, gerek anlatıcı gerekse karakterlerin gözünden / zihninden farklı odaklama düzeylerinden aktarımda bulunulması ve bütün

bunların ayrıca zamanda gidiş-gelişlerle iyice içinden çıkılması zor hale gelmesidir. Odaklamanın hemen her türüne rastlanır bu romanda: anlatı ve öykü dışı anlatıcının dışarıdan ve içerden odaklaması, ayrıca karakterin yaptığı içerden ve dışarıdan odaklamalar. Bu anlatıda, duyusal algıların yansıtılması ve aktarılması dışında bilinç akışı/iç monolog ve dolaylı serbest düşüncenin çok sayıda örneğine rastlamak mümkündür. Anlatıcı anlatı ve öykü dışı üçüncü şahıs bir anlatıcıdır. Bu haliyle anlatıya hakim olması beklenir. Fakat bir çok yerde anlatıyı şekillendiren karakterin görüş açısıdır. Kaldı ki, romanın sonunda anlatının çok önemli bir kısmının böyle olduğu görülür. Burada anlatıcı, bilinçli bir şekilde otorite ve monitoritesini karakterle paylaşmış, Martin'in ölmüş olduğu bilgisini okurdan gizlemiş, ya da kendini karakterin monitoritesine bırakarak görece pasif bir gözlemci olmayı seçmiştir. Karakter ise, bir taraftan anlatı dışı ve öykü dışı anlatıcı tarafından odaklanan, böylece odaklama eyleminin nesnesi olan bir anlatı öğesi iken öte taraftan kendi iç ve dış dünyasındaki nesneleri odaklayan onlara dışarıdan ve içerden bakan bir odaklayıcı durumundadır. Kısaca karakter-odaklayıcı bu romanda hem odaklama nesnesi hem de odaklayıcı özne olarak karşımıza çıkar. Böylece varsayılan okur, romanın önemli bir kısmında, dışarıdan bir anlatıcının karakter hakkındaki yargılarından ziyade bizzat karakterin kendisi ve çevresini algılayışını yine onun zihninden ve görüş açısından öğrenir. Oluşum halindeki karakter, kendi deneyimleri penceresinden değerlendirilme şansına kavuşur. Karakterin canlı imgelemi ve hayal dünyası, duyusal algı ve zihinsel spekülasyonlarındaki renklilik ve çeşitlilik bu sayede dolayımsız biçimde varsayılan okurla buluşur. Bir bulmacanın parçaları gibi karakteri oluşturan unsurlar bir araya geldikçe, anlatım tekniğinin doğal bir sonucu olarak, okur karakterden nefret etmek yerine onu anlamaya çalışır. Hatırlayan ve o sahneleri canlı biçimde okurla buluşturan da onun bilincidir çünkü. Yine, çok renkli ve canlı doğa imgeleri, hayvan imgeleri, çok çeşitli tabiat manzaraları ve sesler, kokular, halüsinasyon ve yanılsamalarla karışık odaksal betimlemeler Martin'in nispeten hayranlık uyandıran yaratıcılığı, şaşırtıcı duyarlığı ve kayda değer entelektüelliği ile birleşir. Ahlaksal temaları işler görünmekle birlikte, bu anlatı da tıpkı *Mirasçılar* gibi asla ahlakçı bir alegori olarak kabul edilemez. Okur

Martin'in geçmiş hatalarını onaylamamakla birlikte ondaki insani tarafla yüzleşmiş, insan gerçeğiyle içerden buluşma ve onu kavrama şansını yakalamıştır. Teknik bir kez daha temanın önüne geçmiş, ders vermekten çok anlama çabası güden bir deneyime dönüşmüştür.

Romanın sonuç kısmı, bir yandan Martin'in içinde bulunduğu durumu açıklar ve temaya hizmet ederken, öte yandan öykü anlatma sanatına ilişkin açık bir göndermede bulunur. Buna göre bu anlatıya asıl hakim olan, varsayılan yazar ve anlatı dışı-öykü dışı olması sebebiyle anlatı içindeki güçlü temsilcisi olan anlatıcıdır. Bu son birkaç sayfalık bölümde, Kaptan davidson ve Bay Campbell Martin'in cesedini bulmuşlardır. Konuşmalarından, Martin'in ilk birkaç dakika içinde ölmüş olduğunu, nitekim botlarını bile çıkarmaya vakit bulamadığını anlarız. Bu nokta, varsayılan okurun en başa dönüp romanı yeniden okuma ihtiyacı hissetmesine neden olacaktır. Kaldı ki, okur Martin'in kayaya çıktığını, botlarını çıkardığını hatırlamaktadır. Martin tam olarak hangi sayfada ölmüştür bu da kesin değildir. Böylece anlatı bizzat kendisi kendi kurgusallığına da atıfta bulunmuş, kendi yarattığı gerçekliği kendisi sarsarak onu farklı bir boyuta sürüklemiştir. Bu kısım, anlatının en dış anlatı düzeyini oluşturmakta ve bütün diğer alt anlatıları içine alarak onları belirlemektedir.

Sonuç olarak, *Pincher Martin*, sadece zamansallık ile oynamaz aynı zamanda gerçeklik ve gerçeklik algısının sınırlarını da sorgulamaya açar. Anlatıların doğası hakkında dikkatli okura son tahlilde bir kurgu ile muhatap olunduğunun uyarısını yapar. Böylece karmaşık anlatı ve odaklama düzeyleri ile farklı görüngeler üreterek insan gerçeğine dair bir araştırma yürütmüş, insanı zaafları ile kavrama çabasının estetik bir örneğini ortaya koyar. Provokatif tekniği ile varsayılan okuru sabit bir görüngeye mahkum etmez, anlatıyı duyusal ve zihinsel aktarımlarla daha derinlikli hale getirir. Bilinç ve biliçdışının sınırlarını, anlatı stratejileri vasıtasıyla araştıran bu romanda, anlatıcı sesin otoritesi mutlak değildir.

Serbest Düşme öz kimliğini yeniden inşa etme çabası içinde geçmişine yönelik bir yeniden okuma (yazma) süreci içine giren birinci şahıs bir anlatıcının

deneyimleri konu edilmektedir. Öykü anlatma, kendi şahsi hikayesini yeniden yazma başat motif olarak karşımıza çıkar. Bu kez, anlatıcı kendi durumunun farkında ve kendini bir karakter olarak anlatısının konusu haline getirmiş bir anlatıcı-odaklayıcıdır. Bu romanın incelendiği bölümde ilk olarak, anlatıbilimsel açıdan anlatı düzeyleri ve odaklama düzeyleri ele alınmıştır. Bu öğeler sayesinde karakterin kimliği oluşma süreci içinde yine içerden bir bakışla gözlemlenir. Fakat, buradaki incelik, anlatıcı öznenin ve anlatılan nesnenin aynı kişi olmasıdır. Bu bakımdan anlatıcı Sammy ile karakter Sammy ayrımı önemlidir ve Sammy'nin anlatım ve odaklamanın kimi zaman nesnesi kimi zaman öznesi durumunda olduğu görülür. Bu yöntemle, anlatıcı kendi geçmişine doğru bir keşfe çıkar ve varoluşun rasyonel ve ruhsal boyutlarına dair ve bu iki boyut arasında bir bağ kurmanın mümkün olup olmadığına ilişkin bir araştırma yürütür. Böylece yine ahlaksal bir temayı ele almış olan Golding, salt ahlaksal yargılarda bulunmak yerine karakteri oluş sürecinde içerden kavramayı ve onu yine zaafları ve potansiyeli ile anlamayı amaçlar.

Romanın anlatıcısı Sammy Mountjoy, daha romanın başında kendi anlatıcı (yazar) statüsüne gönderme yaparak, kendi geçmişine yönelik hayati bir soru yöneltir. Ona göre, hayatının bir noktasında yaptığı bir hata sonrası özgürlüğünü yitirmiş, ve acı çekmeye başlamıştır. Anlatının anlatıcı tarafından belirtilen amacı, özgürlüğün ve saflığın bir daha ele geçmeyecek şekilde yitirildiği bu noktayı bulmaktır. Bu amaçla hafızasını yoklayan Sammy, çocukluğunun geçtiği yoksul varoş semti Rotten Row, yatılı okul günlerinin geçtiği Oxford, ardından gençliğini yaşadığı günler ve Beatrice ile olan macerası, sonra onu terk etmesi, ve ardından gelen diğer olayları hatırlamaya çalışır. Savaş sırasında yaşadığı hücre, hepsi onun kimliğini oluşturan unsurlardır. Fakat onun asıl bulmak istediği tam olarak özgürlüğünü kaybettiği noktadır. Kişiliğinin oluşmasında davranış açısından ahlaklı fakat ideolojik açıdan rasyonel olan Nick Shales ile davranış açısından bencil fakat inanç olarak ahlakçı Miss Pringle'ın rolü büyüktür. Savaştaki tutsaklığı sırasında tanıdığı Dr. Halde ise rasyonelliği hem inanç, hem tutum, hem de davranış olarak benimseyen nadir tutarlı kimselerden biridir.

Sammy bir anlatıcı olarak anlatı dışı (heterodiegetic) fakat öykü içi (homodiegetic) bir anlatıcıdır. Ayrıca bir anlatıcı-odaklayıcı (narrator-focalizer) olarak geçmişi hatırlarken ya da bugünü yansıtırken yine çeşitli odaklama türlerinden yararlandığı görülür. Çocukluğunu anlattığı bölümlerde bir çocuğun görüş açısından sahneler izlenirken, karakterin o anki zihinsel ve psikolojik durumunu yansıtacak nitelikte içerden aktarımlar sunulur. Duyusal algılar yine renkli, zengin ve canlıdır. Karakterin mesleğinin ressamlık olması öyle görünüyor ki varsayılan yazarın özellikle tasarladığı bir durumdur. Golding anlatılarının ortak bir özelliği olarak imge yoğunluğu ve görsellik ön plandadır. Kuşkusuz bunu mümkün kılan odaklamanın etkin kullanımı ve görünge çeşitliliğidir. Anlatıcı-Sammy, karakter-Sammy'nin görüş açısından öz yaşamının çeşitli safhalarını yeniden gözden geçirir ve yeniden yazar.

Bu romanın önemli bir özelliği de kronolojiyi bozması, hikayeyi zamansal gidiş gelişlerle anlatmasıdır. Bu durum, varsayılan okuru zorlayan unsurlardan biri olarak karşımıza çıkar. Sürekli zamansal gelgitler belli bir sistematik göstermez. Ana anlatı ilk bölümden dokuzuncu bölüme kadar belli bir doğrusallık gösterirken, alt anlatılar sayesinde bu kronoloji bozulur. Bu bölümün sonunda karakter-Sammy'nin ta çocukluğuna uzanan karanlık korkusunun izi sürülür. Nitekim onuncu bölümden ondördüncü bölüme kadar bugün ile geçmiş arasındaki gelgitler devam eder. Bugün yaşanan kafa karşıklığı ve huzursuzluğun izleri geçmişte sürülmeye devam eder.

İçerden odaklamanın uygulandığı en önemli sahnelerden biri, karakter-Sammy'nin görüş açısından aktarılan hayali hücre hapsi sahnesidir. Aslında küçücük bir süpürge deposunu hayalinde farelerle, yılanlarla, ölü bedenler ve kesik penislerle canlandıran karakter-Sammy'nin hücre deneyimi içerden bir bakış açısıyla gayet gerçekçi bir şekilde aktarılırken, aynı zamanda varsayılan okur, onun bilinçaltı korkuları ve zihinsel karmaşasına dair bilgilenmiş olur. Anlatıcı-Sammy'nin deyimiyle özgürce akan billur gibi bir su olan küçük Sammy'nin kokmuş bulanık bir gölete dönüşmesinin öyküsü otoriter olmayan bir yöntemle ve bir anlama çabasıyla aktarılır. Böylece anlatım anlamanın ve ifade etmenin bir yöntemine dönüşür. Nitekim anlatıcı-Sammy romanın başında hayatı ifade edecek

uygun bir kalıp aradığını ama başarısız olduğunu söylerken, bir ölçüde sanatın/yaratmanın/yazmanın yani öykü anlatmanın belki bu uygun kalıp olabileceğini ima eder gibidir.

Buradan hareketle, rasyonel ve ruhsal dünyalar arasında kalmış Sammy için her ikisi de gerçek ve mümkündür. Anlatıcı-Sammy salt rasyonalite ile sınırlı bir dünyaya hapsolamayacak denli ruhsal boyutu da olan biridir. Her ne kadar bilinci Beatrice'e yaptığı haksızlıklarla yaralı olsa da, Halde'nin ve Nick Shales'in rasyonel davranış ya da izahları ya da Miss Massey ve Rowena Pringle'ın kaba softalığı hayatı anlamada onun için yeterli gelmez. Tekrar eski özgür ve masum haline dönemeyeceğini bilmekle birlikte, acı çekme potansiyeline sahip birisi olması, anlatıcı-Sammy'nin yaşadıklarını telafi etme olasılığını gündeme getirir. Böylece varsayılan yazar, dolaylı yoldan öykü anlatma eylemini insanın acıları ve zaafları ile anlamaya yarayan uygun ifade biçimi olarak önerir.

Kısacası, *Serbest Düşme* bir retrospectif anlatı örneğidir. Birinci şahıs anlatıcıya sahip olması ve kahramanın anlatının hem öznesi hem de nesnesi olarak konumlandırılması anlatıyı ilginç kılan bir özelliktir. Fakat asıl ilginci, anlatıcının sıklıkla kendi konumuna atıfta bulunarak, öykü anlatmanın doğasına ilişkin konuşması ve bilinçli bir anlatıcı olduğunu ortaya koymasıdır. Böylece öykü anlatma hem bir motif, hem bir tema, hem de rasyonel olan ve olmayan dünyalar arasındaki muhtemel bir bağlantı imkanı olarak sunulur. Yine çeşitli odaklamaların kullanılması yoluyla farklı görüngelerin yaratılması, anlatımı zenginleştiren, anlatıyı ise derinleştiren ve renklendiren bir unsur olarak kabul edilebilir.

Golding'in incelenen üç romanı birlikte ele alındığında anlatıcı-odaklayıcı ve karakter odaklayıcıların belirgin biçimde "görünge" (perspective and parspectivisation) ile meşgul olduğu söylenebilir. Görünge, bir anlatı söyleminde monitoriteyi ortaya çıkaran öğedir. Bu romanlarda çoğunlukla otorite ile monitorite aynı anlatı unsurunda toplanmaz. Anlatıcı ses ve anlatı düzeylerinin ürettiği otorite, görünge çeşitliliği ile dengelenir. Çünkü, bu romanlarda sadece anlatıcı değil, karakterler de odaklayıcı rolü üstlenebilirler. Bu durum, aynı

zamanda, Jahn'ın işaret ettiği gibi, varsayılan okuru salt anlatıcı otoritesinden kurtaran bir özelliktir. Bu sayede hakim otorite kırıldığı/dengelendiği gibi, hakim ideoloji de farklı görüngelerin ima ettiği farklı ideolojiler ile dengelenecek, çeşitlenecektir (burada ideoloji, Rimmon Kenan ve Mieke Bal'ın belirttiği bağlamda düşünülmelidir). Örneğin, *Mirasçılar* ve *Pincher Martin*'de, anlatı dışı-öykü dışı anlatıcıların otoritesinin karakter-odaklayıcıların monitoritesi tarafından zayıflatıldığı/paylaşıldığı görülür. Yine *Free Fall*'da, anlatı dışı anlatıcı öykü içi bir konumda yani karakter olmasına rağmen, anlatıcı-Sammy'nin otoritesi karakter-Sammy'nin monitoritesi ile dengelenir.

Üç roman birlikte ele alındığında göze çarpan diğer bir nokta ise, üçünün de varsayılan okuru eşzamanlı okumalar (simultaneous double reading) yapmak zorunda bırakmasıdır. *Mirasçılar*'da epigraf, *Pincher Martin*'de sonuç kısmı (the coda) ve *Free Fall*'daki hayali hücre deneyimi bu tarz okumaları zorunlu kılan parçalardandır. Ayrıca, anlatı düzeylerinin çeşitlilik göstermesi, farklı odaklama düzeylerinin değişken görüngeler yaratması da anlatı birimleri arasında çelişki ya da ayrımlara (gap) yol açmakta, bunlar da eşzamanlı okumaları zorunlu kılmaktadır. Varsayılan okur, *Mirasçılar*'da bir yandan epigraftaki betimlemeyi aklında tutarken, öte yandan Lok'un görüş açısından olayları takip ederek Neandertalleri içerden tanımaya çalışır. Aynı anda da anlatıcının diliyle muhatap olduğu için, Lok'u hem içerden hem de dışarıdan aynı anda gözlemler. Bunun en güzel örneklerinden biri, Lok, Fa ve Liku'nun ölmüş bir geyiği parçalayıp yerkenki sahnede bulunabilir. Varsayılan okur bu sahnede hem sempati ve iğrenmeyi aynı anda yaşar. Ya da Homo sapiens Lok'a ok fırlattığında, anlatı Lok'un görüş açısından oku hediye olarak tanıtsa da, varsayılan okur durumun farkındadır. *Pincher Martin*'de varsayılan okur eşzamanlı olarak Martin'in fiziksel ve entelektüel varoluş mücadelesini izlerken, aynı anda onun geçmişiyle yüzleşmesine de tanık olur. Sonuç kısmında, Martin'in zaten ölmüş olduğu ortaya çıktığında ise, bütün sahneler yeniden gözünün önüne gelerek, hayali kaya üzerinde yaşananların anlamı farklı bir boyut kazanır. *Serbest Düşme*'de ise, varsayılan okur bir yandan anlatıcı-Sammy'nin bugünkü durumunu (being), öte

yandan ise oluşmakta olan kişiliğini (becoming) izler. Varsayılan okurun dikkati aynı anda iki Sammy'de yani öykü'de ve öykü anlatımı'ndadır.

VITA

Surname, Name: Çıraklı, Mustafa Zeki
Nationality: TR
Date and Place of Birth: April 09, 1973; Ünye / Ordu
Email: mzcirakli@gmail.com

EDUCATION:

Degree	Institution	Year Of Graduation
MA	Atatürk University, TURKEY	2001
BA	19 Mayıs University, TURKEY	1998
High School	Ünye High School (Ünye Lisesi)	1989

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
1998	MEB	English Teacher
1999	KTU	English Lecturer
2001	KTU	Research Assistant
2002	METU	Research Assistant
2007	T.C. ARMY	Interpreter Lieutenant