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Narration and focalization constitute fundamental areas of interest in the transgeneric narrative theory of poetry criticism, and play the central role of allowing for a staging of the extent to which narratology is productive in theoretical conceptions and analyses of mediation in Byron’s poetry, and the secondary one of providing narrative forms for investigating the intersections of transgeneric narrative theory and culture. This is the main goal of my study. Although current debate in transgeneric narrative theory of poetry has shown that deploying a narrative approach to mediation in poetic discussions is apt to illuminate theoretical and analytical functions of narratology in an apparently disparate discipline like poetry, certain categories of narratorial voice, metanarrative clues, perspective structure, narrative strategies for the representation of consciousness, and catagories of focalization have either received partial treatment or been completely ignored. The transgeneric narrative theory of poetry has conceptualized the mediacy of narrative transmission in terms of the categories of the biographical author, the textual subject, the speaker or narrator, the protagonist, and types of perspectives (retrospective homodiegetic and simultaneous homodiegetic narration), hence revealing exclusive interest in agents and levels of mediacy that are structuralist oriented, and common to lyric texts. Consequently, narrative theory of poetry has neglected the further levels of mediacy that are structural and context-sensitive such as authorial narration, the reflector modes, first-person forms (narrating objects, communal voice), levels of perspective, and the internal and external levels of focalization. In its theoretical conception of mediation, transgeneric narratology has disregarded questions such as what narrative structures are suitable for locating context-specific issues of ideology and literary values of a given literary period in a text. Considering the importance of the above categories and issues both for a theoretical reconceptualization of mediation, and to an extent, for investigating the intersections of narratological approaches to mediation and culture, the methodology of this study consists in synthesizing representations of mediacy drawn from the insights of classical and post classical narrative theory and cultural narratology. In other words, combining concepts from structuralist narratology and cultural narratology (aiming to show that narrative is reproduced from cultures and contributes to the understanding of the very cultures from which it emanates) would constitute cornerstones for a transgeneric narratology which is still in the process of development.
By evolving a broadly synthesized and dynamic transgeneric narrative theory of mediacy for poetry criticism, this study aims at bridging both the theoretical and analytical gaps created by transgeneric narrative theory of poetry and extant literature on Byron’s poetry deploying narratology respectively. The suitability of the innovative approach to mediation is demonstrated in the exemplary analysis of narrative poems written by Byron in the period 1788-1824. The analysis of these poems reveals that Byron’s poetry provides narrative phenomena ranging from voice, narrating objects, mental and extra-mental aspects, consciousness representation strategies, perspectives, and forms of perceiving that may encourage a reading of a poetic text as narration, focalization, or representation of an ideology or context; and also facilitate an understanding of ways narratology is linked to cultural narratology. By assimilating issues of culture or context into narratology, transgeneric narratology is not only widened; it provides productive interpretive and analytical tools which enable the study to address peculiar narrative strategies of different kinds of narrative (prose) fiction that are constructed in Byron’s narrative verse, and the effects allowed. While the above categories of mediation may allow for an understanding of the ways in which Byron’s poetry provides phenomena for narrative staging of narration and focalization, they also constitute specific strategies for a forging of a scope of stimulating functions of narrative in poetry that deals with story telling, cultures, contexts and ideologies. In sum, the analysis enhances a further understanding of Byron’s poetry.
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I. INTRODUCTION

How completely novelistic Byron’s poetry has become can be illustrated [...]. Byron’s mode, consequently, is not merely colloquial but narrative too, and looks forward to that style of ironically colloquial narration which plays such a large part in nineteenth-century fiction.

(Karl Kroeber 1973: 176, 180)

Lyric texts in the narrow sense of the term (i.e. not just obviously narrative poems such as ballads, romances, and verse stories) have the same three fundamental narratological aspects (sequentiality, mediacy, and articulation) as prose narratives such as novels and novellas.

(Hühn/Schönert 2005: 2)

Since [...] poems generally feature the same fundamental constituents as narrative fiction - referring to a particular sequence of incidents (in connection with existents), mediating it from a particular perspective, and indicating the act of utterance or articulation through which the sequence is mediated in the medium of a verbal text - narratological categories may profitably be applied to the analysis of lyric poetry [...].

(Hühn 2004: 140)

If there is one thing as yet to be emphasized in the theory of poetry, it is the proposal for an innovative, dynamic, and broadly systematized transgeneric narratological approach to mediation that can be applied in the study of narrators, narrating characters, mental characters, fictional minds and focalizers in Byron’s poetry.¹ Transgeneric narratology is not used in this study in the restricted sense of Hühn (2004: 139-158) who developed the approach to satisfy

¹ This line of argument follows Hühn’s and Schönert’s (2005: 2), and Hühn’s (2004; 2005). In the 2005 edition, Hühn particularly raises the important point that theoretical foundations in poetry criticism are increasingly being deplored as deficient, its analytical categories and procedures criticized as intuitive, eclectic and unsystematized. See also Fludernik’s (1996: 358) lament that the theory of poetry looks like a ‘conceptual wilderness’ which can also be understood to imply the lack of a broadly defined narrative approach that is apt to answer questions dealing with narration and focalization in poetry.
the needs of the lyric specifically. The approach does not attempt to answer the question of who speaks by relying only on the limited categories of the biographical author, the textual subject, the speaker or narrator and the protagonist that Hühn proposed for the same purpose. Along a similar line of argument, it does not rely exclusively on Hühn’s strategies of constructing levels of perspective (simultaneous homodiegetic narration and retrospective homodiegetic narration) as the constitutive elements of focalization. In other words, the prevailing sense in which the term transgeneric narratology is used in poetry criticism is ‘neither the only nor the most useful way the [concept] can be applied in the study of narrat[ion]’ and focalization, when one considers that Byron’s narrative poetry specifically adopts the narrative (prose) tradition of storytelling. It does so by the use of elements of mediation such as the linguistic ones, narrators, characters, perspective structure, culture specific elements and the mental and perceptual strategies that can be drawn from insights into both classical narratology and cultural narratology. I wish, therefore, to propose an innovative expansion of Hühn’s transgeneric approach to poetry criticism in which concepts of narratorial voice, narrating subjects, characters, focalization, perspective structure, metanarrative devices, tense categories, mental and extra-mental forms of narration and imagery that can be used to construct voice, mental characters, perspective and focalization are considered. These can be brought together through a combination of insights from narratology and cultural narratology in the hope that a dynamic approach may, in theory and practice, be able to provide methodological tools and fresh approaches to address issues of narrative communication and contexts in Byron’s poetry. The reader is invited, then, to join the study in reflecting on the following questions as a prelude to my investigations into the forms and functions of narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry.

---

2 Cf. Rubik’s (2005: 189; 194) conception that genre theory of the lyric argues for differences between poetry and narrative, and has influenced scholars attempting to characterise the lyric to rely on attributes ‘necessary for inclusion of a text in the poetic canon’. See also Werner Wolf’s (2005) argument that poetry is a genre originally intended to provide meaning by means of imagery, versification, and other forms of over- semantization. Werner Wolf (32) regrets that most approaches to the lyric tend to be normative, and conceptualizes the lyric as a ‘fixed essence’. This is a view she challenges on grounds that it has inspired some scholars to privilege versification or ‘unmediated subjectivity’ as the defining qualities of the lyric with the result that prose poems or ballads have often been ignored in poetry criticism. These theoretical reflections are important in this study for they are already an indication that narrative theory would be more productive in a genre like poetry considering that the latter also disseminates meaning by means of elements of story telling often attributed to the narrative tradition.

3 For the use of the phrase, see Ansgar Nünning, (2001: 207) in a different context.
Are there theoretical grounds to speak, as Kroeber (1973: 176) has done, of the ‘novelistic’ tendencies in Byron’s narrative verse?4 Put differently, what implications do such assumptions that Byron constructed tales or wrote poetry in the ‘narrative’5 tradition foreground? Does such a claim invoke the illusion that the poetry under study carries with it almost the same narrative elements as narrative (prose) fiction? Does the claim, in other words, feature assumptions that the poetry under study constructs a diversity of linguistic, mental and consciousness representation categories of representing agents of narration and focalization on the levels of story and discourse6 in a narrative act? Can one, further, suggest that voice, non-human agents like animals which can be given a linguistic identity, and thus endowed with voice also constitute culture-specific forms of narrative features inherent in Byron’s poetry? The reader may also find the use of the term ‘prose’ apparently unconventional especially when applied to poetry written in the romantic literary period, as was Byron’s.7

More curiously still, if Byron’s verbatim declaration of writing verse tales or prose poetry (echoed in many respects by Frye and Kroeber) invokes the question of generic

4 The understanding that the function of narrative is ‘to tell a story’ and therefore to ‘report’ facts (real or fictive), is provided by Genette (1980: 161). Following Genette’s argument, it seems to me that any narratological reading of Byron’s poetry would be incomplete if consideration is not given to the narrative tradition of story telling.

5 For many references to Byron’s poetry in the narrative tradition, see Kroeber (1966 [1960]; 1973: 176), Frye (1963: 170; 178), Kirchner (1973), and M. K. Joseph (1964: 48). See also Byron’s (1948) declarations in “Don Juan” and “Beppo”, especially his emphasis in “Beppo” that he is writing ‘prose’ in verse.

6 For the distinction between story and discourse, see Chatman (1986; 1978: 19-20), and Jahn (2005: N2.1.2). Although Chatman’s distinction between story and discourse appears to restrict focalization as an element of story (a point I, however, disagree with), I adopt his point of view that the narrator occupies the discourse while characters are often situated on the story level. The distinction between story and discourse in view of their relationship with the question of narrator and character focalization shall be analysed in due course. My argument here is that Byron’s poetry transforms actions and mental states into stories which are told with the aid of narrative strategies. In view of such an argument, both formal elements and other categories by which stories are represented need to be subsumed under transgeneric approach to poetic mediacy since they can constitute the sign of the identity of the subject whose voice and perception constitute the story in the story and discourse levels of the text.

7 The question of literary periods and generic distinctions has been a very controversial issue in literary criticism and has engaged the attention of critics and genre theorists in many different ways. Henry Bonnet’s (1978: 5) critical lamentation: ‘We are faced with such a variety that it seems to mock all our efforts at classification. Actually, we are in the presence not only of essential genres, but of formal genres, of varieties […] or hybrids’ can be cited here. The statement above may be understood to mean that although Byron wrote during the Romantic literary period; his style of writing reveals a reliance on no particular literary tradition. The reader would consequently realize that Byron’s sub-genre of poetry – the narrative verse is neither aesthetically mutually exclusive nor period restricted, evident in its accommodation of tendencies usually attributed to narrative (prose) fiction. Such an argument may exonerate the study from obvious criticisms about borrowing concepts from narrative theory and imposing them in a context like poetry apparently alien in form and methodology or even intention. For more on general notions about literary period and genre criticism, see Heather Dubrow (1982), Rene Wellek and Austen Warren (1949: 278), Warnke, F.J. (1969/70: 145-162) in the same volume, and Helen Gardner (1963).
hybridity and suggest the assimilation of narration and focalization in his poetry - does that guarantee sufficient grounds to claim that Byron works with new forms of poetic expression and eventually with different narrative requirements of meaning-making in poetry? To be more specific, if writing poetry in the narrative tradition of story telling implies a new type of poetic sub-genre that Byron developed, is that further sufficient reason to argue that it is impossible to think about Byron without taking into consideration narrative\(^8\) forms of mediation and focalization? In view of the issues raised above, the unavoidable task for the study is to propose the narrative forms by which the affinities between this poetry and the narrative (prose) tradition can be established, and analyzed to conform to assumptions that Byron wrote narrative verse. In so doing, one may attempt to establish a theoretical and methodological basis by which Byron’s affirmative declarations of experimenting with the narrative tradition may find relevant justification.

At first glance - and in view of the Romantic conventional poetic practice (that evades narrative from its definitions) and the obvious question of generic distinctions by which poetry has often been evaluated -, the analogy between poetry and narrative (prose) fiction and, to an extent, between narrative and a discipline like cultural history may seem problematic. It may even create the impression of attempting to blur the differences between poetry and the narrative (prose) fictive genre, as well as that between poetry and other disciplines outside literature. Without ignoring the fact that poetry and narrative fiction as well as other discourses make different demands on their functions and methodology, one needs to point out that discourse which distinguishes itself by the use of story telling elements such as voice, mediating objects, mental and perspective dimensions, would obviously privilege narratology for its investigations. Evidently, narrative theory has, to a commendable extent, been acknowledged to possess descriptive and interpretive tools with the potential of reconceptualizing the forms by which agents of narrative transmission of meaning are systematized, and by which mediation itself is constructed and endowed with meaning.

\(^8\) In his article “Games with Time”, Ricoeur (1995 [1984]: 82), discusses the essential elements of a narrative when he argues that a ‘narrative tells a story’ by someone. Arguing along similar lines this study proposes that the introduction of culture-specific forms of voice, levels of perspective, mental representations, and linguistic parameters including objects like animals that can be transformed into linguistic subjects for the purpose of meaning-making constitute the features by which story telling enters Byron’s narrative poetry, and may lead to significant modifications in the conception of narrators and focalizers. For more on the definition of narrative, see Prince (1987), Genette (1988 [1983]: 17), Bal (1985), and, more specifcally, Jahn’s (2005: N2.1.2) argument that anything that tells a story - be it pictures, performance, novels, comic trips, plays, films etc. - would constitute a narrative. If one were to adopt Jahn’s definition, one would consider Byron’s poetry as narrative because some of his poems embody certain fundamental features often attributed to the narrative (prose) tradition such as story telling and mediation, and this study needs these elements for its analysis of narration and focalization.
Regarding the questions raised above, therefore, the quotations at the beginning find justification when Byron’s verse tales are read as narrative as would be shown in due course. Through its story telling status, and through its characteristic incorporation of certain narrative forms of voice, perception, mental and extra-mental patterns, poetry may be said to have affinities with narrative fiction.

In the following I wish to speak about the motivations for my choice of approach. One of the recent moves in post-classical narratology has been a common supposition that narratology can be broadened through a synthesis with parallel discourses in the hope of opening up new and underemphasized areas of mediacy for investigation. Hühn’s (2005: 2) transgeneric narratology (to which this work is highly indebted) has proposed the application of narratology to poetry which he says is ‘notoriously lacking in theoretical foundations’ (2005: 2). Taking the argument even further, most narrative theorists have opted for an interdisciplinary approach to the description, interpretation, and analysis of narrative fiction, pointing out that narrative theory can be invigorated by insights from neighboring disciplines to allow for ‘a major innovational expansion and reorientation’ (Fludernik 1996: 345). Although the proposal for making narratology productive across literary disciplines has often been restricted to narrative fiction, one needs to point out that Byron’s narrative verse itself is produced from a conjunction of symbolic narrative forms that occur in poetry as well as in narrative fiction (though they attract less attention in poetry criticism than in narrative fiction itself). In this thesis I share, first, Hühn’s view that poetry including verse stories contain central distinguishing elements of narrative fiction such as mediating entities and ‘mode[s]’ of mediation (voice and perspective) and, second, Fludernik’s view on the question of

_____

9 Chatman (1978: 33-34) understands ‘mediation’ to mean a narrative that creates the impression of story being told by someone (‘telling’) as opposed to a ‘narrated’ story which does not give traces of a noticeable presence. His distinction is valid although it needs further elaboration and theoretical backing in view of narrative forms of constructing and analysing mental states subsumed under the figural reflector mode to which we shall return. Notice that Pascal’s (1977) definition of free indirect speech as dual voice, also implying the fusion of figural and authorial narration, suggests that mediacy can be achieved overtly through a narrator, and also covertly by means of a reflector (cf. Cohn 1981: 172).

10 Hühn and Schönert (2005: 2) have proposed voice and levels of perspective as two important defining features of mode of mediation, a distinction I also share. Genette (1980) understands mode as a manner of narrating, and elaborates on mode and voice as categories of narrative discourse. Stanzel (1971) identifies mode (and also voice and subject) as one of the distinctive features that mediacy of presentation can assume, and explains it under the categories of narrator and reflector. For more on mode as a category of mediacy, and the problems and ambiguities attending it, see Cohn (1981: 170-174).

11 Hühn and Schönert (2005: 8) provide a useful definition of voice pointing out that it involves direct linguistic expression whose deictic (pronominal, temporal, spatial, and modal) orientation is provided by the speaking subject. Genette (1980), Rimmon-Kenan (1983), Aczel (1998), and Jahn (2005) understand voice in conceptual terms to mean ‘telling’ as distinct from focalization. Lanser (1992) takes a step away from such
making narratology benefit from travelling concepts aiming to make it more productive in a domain apparently considered in opposition to its methodological and analytical needs, like poetry.

One may add that with the exception of Hühn’s transgeneric approach\textsuperscript{12} to mediation (to which we shall return), most theoretical developments in poetry criticism have often built on the assumption that poetry (the lyric) is an autonomous genre, based exclusively on certain distinct features and governed by such an apparently generic warning as ‘No trespassing […] beyond linguistic speech acting’ (Fludernik 1996: 358).\textsuperscript{13} Generic theorists such as Frye (1985) and Abad-Garcia (2005) among others have provided examples of such generic classifications and distinctions as pointed out by Fludernik (1996), Müller-Zettelmann and Rubik (2005). Generic poetic theories featured by the above theorists have often regarded the lyric as a discursive context meant to disseminate meaning through imagery, versification (prosody), and other forms of ‘over-semantization’ (Wolfgang Müller 2005). As they argue further, such assumptions have often resulted in directing attempts at classifying poetry as a lyric as Frye (1985) and others have done. Owing to the centrality of narrative in Byron’s poetry, its various forms and the uses that can be made of these forms in the analysis of Byron’s poetry and in the wider field of cultural history in general, it is surprising how little attention in poetic criticism has so far been paid to a transgeneric narrative description of narrative poetry. It is even more surprising how little or no attempt has been made in poetry criticism to develop a narratologically grounded theoretical framework that goes beyond the scope of structuralist orientations to integrate insights from a relevant and parallel discourse like cultural narratology that attempts to answer questions dealing with contexts by means of narrative forms. Based on the above point, it appears that narrative poetry has not been adequately taken into account in theoretical conceptions of the relationship of narrative and culture.

\textsuperscript{12} Hühn’s “Transgeneric Narratology” (2004: 140) currently is one of the approaches in poetry criticism dealing directly with narrative theory. He develops this approach to explain the lyric’s proclivity for certain features often attributed to narrative fiction such as sequentiality and mediation. This study relies on Hühn’s terminology, but also attempts to bolster it with certain dimensions of mediacy that his approach does not cover, which classical and post classical narratology provide to answer questions dealing with narrative mediation and culture, as will be shown in due course.

\textsuperscript{13} For more on poetry criticism that attempts to circumscribe the lyric within generic and normative definitions; see Müller-Zettelmann and Rubik (2005); see also genre-oriented poetic theories such as Frye and others in the 1985 edition which largely concentrates on lyric specific features.
Regrettably, in view of its centrality for the study, narratological endeavors to provide conceptual solutions for coming to terms with issues of narrative mediation and focalization have received more attention in narrative prose fiction than in poetry, specifically the verse narrative, which cannot be circumscribed by generic restrictions, owing to its largely assimilated narrative (prose) forms. Where Hünn (2004), and Hünn and Schönert (2005) stop at the crucial claim that the theory of poetry has been deprived of narratological tools to construct agents and dimensions of mediation, Ansgar Nünning (2000) goes further and laments the negligence of critics and narrative theorists in incorporating insights of cultural history into narratology. The issues raised are crucial for this study’s theoretical and methodological needs. By arguing that the poetic ‘territory […] looks much like a terminological and conceptual wilderness [because] the signs demarcating the natural process of poetic effusion for me read ‘No trespassing’ beyond linguistic ‘speech-acting’’, Fludernik (1996: 358) can also be understood as invoking the question of generic distinctions and, possibly, that of the present lack of adequate research on narratology in poetry criticism.

Along similar lines of argument, in an attempt to explore new areas in cultural narratological terms where traditional narratologists (Structuralists, Classical or Formalists) not only ‘fear to tread’, but have put up signs reading ‘Trespassers will be prosecuted’ Ansgar Nünning (2000: 355; 357) appears to stress the need for a narratology with a cross-disciplinary focus on cultural issues. Narratology in general and interdisciplinary transgeneric narratology in particular is one of such frameworks that may be analytically useful in poetry dealing with story telling and issues of contexts notwithstanding the apparent critical assumptions that narrative and poetry are antagonistic genres. If for Ansgar Nünning (2000: 345) the one thing that narratology has been deprived of since its beginnings in the late 60s is cultural history - it is also the case for this study. An innovative and broadly synthesized transgeneric narratological approach that integrates insights from narratology and cultural history is still on the threshold of poetry criticism. At first sight, such a transgeneric narrative-oriented focus may pose the obvious methodological difficulties of finding common intersections between transgeneric narratology and cultural narratology. Yet, when one considers that these disciplines provide narrative representations for coming to terms with issues of narrative and culture, it becomes obvious that they have certain shared features.14

---

14 Except for Hünn’s and Schönert’s to whose poetic theory of narrative mediacy we shall return I know not of any study that has introduced narrative theory into poetry criticism.
This study shares first Ansgar Nünning’s, Fludernik’s and also Hühn’s and Schönert’s claims that the theory of poetry has often ignored its fundamental narrative features. The bearings such theoretical reflections have on the study of narration and focalization cannot be overlooked. Further, the new directions of research in narratological theories dealing with the intersections of narrative theory and culture/contexts also constitute new critical issues in the recent contribution to making the project of transgeneric narratology work in Byron’s poetry. The insights of cultural narratology has partly shaped and informed my new conceptualization of the development of transgeneric narratological poetics. This is an approach I consider to be dynamic and capable of answering narrative questions not only in poetry but also in the broader field of narrative (which also covers cultural studies).

In addition to issues discussed above, certain ideas raised in the project are inspired by early analysis of narrative features and focalization in Byron’s poetry (as will be seen in the analysis of extant literature) that I find restricted, axiomatically stated or ignored. In view of the complex narrative aspects and cultural contexts of Byron’s poetry (discussed here with respect to narrative, Romantic values and postcolonial ideologies) and considering the insufficient emphasis it has received in the light of narratological reproduction of these contexts, my project is intended to provide a reference framework by which the created gap can be filled. An explanation for the motivations for my choice of transgeneric narratology as a suitable framework for dealing with questions regarding narration and focalization in poetry leads directly to my central theoretical background or research problem.

1. In the field of poetry criticism, there are missing concepts that would show how narrative mediation would be productive for the analysis of narrative structures in lyric poetry.

2. My second presupposition is that critics applying narratological categories to the analysis of Byron’s poetry have not adequately explored the forms and functions of narration, focalization, culture-specific elements and linguistic forms that may be fruitful for constructing both narrative and contexts in this genre. By applying narrative structures in the

---


16 In this study, I will use the terms cultural history or cultural narratology or culture interchangeably to refer to those linguistic forms of narration and focalization which a reader may draw on in the reading process to reproduce a given ideological context, values and ethics or even position an individual writer’s work within a given literary genre or literary period.
analysis of Byron’s poetry, aiming to take into account the specific kind of narration that the said poetry constructs, it is possible to discuss literary genres that are not traditionally viewed as narrative such as the lyric.

3. My third assumption is that perspective structure of the theory of narrative should be extended to include cultural categories so that they can influence one another as well as enable Byron’s poetry fulfill the crucial sociological function of recreating contexts. In view of the problems identified, the study evolves around the following aims and hypotheses:
   i. To develope a new conceptualization of transgeneric narrative theory of poetry aiming to provide narrative tools that are both structuralist and culture oriented for the analyses of narrative structures in lyric texts.
   ii. To show the role of narrative elements in the analysis of the poetry of Byron.
   iii. To show that Byron’s poetry provides narrative categories that are able to tackle the problems brought up for discussion in this study (since it transposes linguistic, mental and consciousness representational tools into narrative forms that inturn express its real narrative and specific sociohistorical and cultural contexts).
   iv. To demonstrate that by applying narrative categories to the analysis of Byron’s poetry, it is possible to construct a range of narrative meanings in a genre traditionally attributed a semanticising agenda, and eventually, to speak about the extent to which this poetry constructs cultures by narrative means. The main aim of this study is thus to analyse how transgeneric narrative theory of mediacy can be productive for both the theoretical conception and analysis of mediation in Byron’s poetry.

In line with these aims, my mode of emplotment in the theoretical chapter will be a synthesis of approaches and constitutes an attempt at evolving a theoretical and methodological framework for establishing the intersections of transgeneric narratology and cultural narratology. My mode of emplotment in chapters three and four will be analytical. The question of how mediacy of narrative transmission is staged in Byron’s poetry is crucial here. I will deploy the fundamental strategies of mediation that evolve from the alliance between narratology and cultural narratology to stage narration and focalization in Byron’s narrative verse. To come to terms with my main aims, I will propose a range of devices to analyze narration and focalization ranging from categories of distinction\(^7\) to those of

\(^7\) It should be noted that although some of these narrative categories and strategies overlap or, ‘converge at certain points’ (David Herman 2003: 310), they however constitute distinct representational and analytical
interpretation and analysis which include voice strategies, metanarrative elements, narratee signals, interior monologue, narrated monologue, psychonarration, psychoanology, tense modes, speech categories, deictics, perceptual forms or ‘viewing and perceiving’ strategies (Fludernik 1996), and linguistic forms, to name a few. Such a comprehensive framework will enable the study to answer the crucial question of the forms and functions that narration and focalization may allow in the analysis of Byron’s narrative poetry. The narrative features of Byron’s poetry shall also be crucial for the determination of the role Byron’s narrative poetry dealing with story telling may play in reproducing the post colonial psyche, Romantic values, and also in the construction of narrative poetics. Further, such a project may allow the study to update transgeneric narratology beyond classical or Structuralist emphasis on formal features that are specific to narrative texts. By arguing that formal structures of Byron’s poetry can reproduce narrative and contexts, this project may eventually lead to diverse innovative ways of speaking about Byron’s narrative poetry, and may provide further narrative poetics for a transgeneric narratology which is still in the process of development. Such a project may also create avenues for further questions and further research such as the investigation of the relationship between the narrative and contexts of Byron’s poetry which appears to have received no attention as yet. This brings me to speak about the theoretical background/methodology for my research.

As said earlier, this study aims to provide an innovative expansion of transgeneric narrative theory of poetry. The objective will be achieved by synthesizing approaches to the study of narration and focalization drawn from transgeneric narratology, structuralist approaches, post classical narratology and cultural narratology aiming to develop an integrative model of transgeneric narrative theory of poetry. In a bid to recreate the narrative, the Romantic and post colonial contexts of Byron’s poetry by means of formal features aiming to link aspects of narration and focalization provided by Byron’s poetry to issues of ideology, contexts and values, and considering that the modifications within transgeneric narratology may be insufficient without the insights of narrative theory (classical and post classical)\(^\text{18}\), the methodology for my research is integrative, descriptive, interpretive and tools for narrative construction of voice and focalization at different textual levels. Each category, I would argue, is necessary for the particular function it generates.

analytical, involving a synthesis of relevant concepts of dealing with mediation from narratology and cultural history. In so doing, I will propose the various forms of narration and focalization that link these fields.

It is evident from the above research goals that the project does not privilege any particular approach to mediacy, but rather intends to incorporate a range of approaches dealing with questions of narrative mediation both from classical and post-classical narratology. The reason for relying on many approaches dealing with mediation is that no particular approach may be sufficient to address the multidimensional demands of the study. Part of the reasons for drawing on concepts from narratology and a relevant research area like cultural narratology is, according to this study, justifiable in the sense that Byron’s narrative verse itself largely conveys its meaning through such narrative features or story telling parameters like voice, mind forms, focalization, and ‘viewing and experiencing’ strategies which are relevant for representing issues of contexts and cultures in texts. Hence the transgeneric approach to mediation can be broadened by going beyond the boundaries of Hühn’s approach or even the classical/structuralist conception of narration and focalization on which he largely draws. By attempting to bring together different approaches dealing with mediation, transgeneric narratology may be broadened in theoretical scope. Such an argument also implies that Hühn’s approach, in the manner of structuralist narratology, conceptualizes poetry restrictively in terms of limited categories of voice and focalization since he appears to

19 While I adopt Ansgar Nünning’s (2000: 357) definition of cultural narratology as “a kind of integrated approach that focuses on the cultural analysis of narrative fictions and the ubiquity of narratives in cultures, both past and present”, I need to caution that “I am not, however, going to explore the broader field of literary history, which are concerned with the writing of literary history and ideologies”, I am also not concerned with defining culture or literary history, Marxism or even national identity often linked to such notions as culture, (Ansgar Nünning, 2000). Rather, I am using literary history to imply Byron’s individual contribution to literary history of narrative and to speak about the ways postcolonial issues, ideologies, and values of narrative and Romantic literary traditions are enshrined in forms produced by narration and focalization.

20 Cf. Palmer’s (2002: 28) argument that narrative categories like free indirect discourse, interior monologue, focalization and “reflectorization” have been proposed by narratologists for representing the mental life of characters. Adopting Palmer’s (28) point of view still, ‘these concepts do not add up to a complete and coherent study of all aspects of the minds of characters in novels’ and narratives in general. I wish therefore to propose that perspective (which is used here not to imply narration and focalization), understood by Ansgar Nünning (2001: 207) to mean aspects that define a character’s or a narrator’s subjective worldview, and one add-psychological view point, be included in the study of mental strategies. For more on areas of character’s minds that are not necessarily inner speech, see forms of mental elements proposed by Palmer (31) such as mood, desires, emotions, sensations, visual images, imagination, attitudes, and memory.

21 Fludernik (1996: 345) has used the terms to imply certain strategies for identifying focalization, and opposes these perceptual frames to telling (often associated with voice).
ignore the notion of perspective structure, communal voice and other categories we shall introduce in due course.

A brief discussion on the study’s hypotheses takes us to a further important aspect of the study dealing with the choice of the text corpus. The study seeks to explore the narrative forms by which the concept of mediation may be analyzed in Byron’s narrative poetry written during the Romantic period. This particular period saw the incorporation of narrative features of story telling into individual works as in Byron’s case. My reasons for delimiting my corpus to narrative verse are twofold. The verse narrative provides narrative representations that conform to the expectations of my hypotheses. Byron’s poetry features a corpus of verse narrative which tells stories by means of narratorial voice, mental and perceptual forms. The specific shared features of mediation which dominate the corpus comprise narrators, narrating characters, consciousness representation strategies and focalization. These categories are constructed in Byron’s verse tales in almost the same degree of emphasis as in narrative (prose) fiction and therefore permit me to use the verse narrative as a staging ground for my analysis of narration and focalization. It is therefore logical that the verse narrative matches the criteria which the transgeneric approach that evolves from the alliance between narratology and cultural narratology are grounded, and that explains why the text corpus is prioritized. In choosing the corpus, I have considered to what extent it contains narrative features relevant for my discussion of narrative and contexts in Byron’s poetry. This brings me to speak about the suitability of interdisciplinary transgeneric narrative theory for the study.22

When one characterizes a corpus of texts as verse narrative, one may have the intention to contextualize in order to find a more suitable theoretical framework for its discussion. The following discussion contextualizes the corpus chosen for analysis partly to enable me to speak about the specific sociocultural and narrative contexts of Byron’s poetry, and eventually to show that the said contexts are enshrined in narrative and formal structures. In contextualizing the corpus, one would be in a position to speak about aspects of the narrative tradition and their functions in Byron’s poetry.

Traditional genre theory of poetry, as has been pointed out by many critics including Werner Wolf (2005), has taken for granted the fact that the lyric is defined by generic norms.

22 Nünning/Nünning (2004: 45) also agree that the genre and period to which a text belongs are also an important consideration when choosing an approach.
Writers, critics, and some genre theorists including some reviewers of Byron’s poetry have apparently tended to consider Romantic poetry in general as the product of imagination controlled often by monologic lyrical speakers. Müller-Zettelmann and Rubik (2005) point out that the emphasis genre theorists have placed on issues of biography and the autonomy of the poetic artifact has had the result that the internal textual patterning has become the central point of focus. It is significant to note here that genre theory of poetry appears to put emphasis only on the formal, thematic and generic attributes of the lyric and the extent to which these permit an understanding of poetry. What is regrettably missing in such generic assumptions is the fact that certain individual works transgress the boundaries of convention and generic definitions in their potential of incorporating cultures and other genres. Such cases may require a new contextualization and methodology. This is the case with Byron’s poetry whose careful reading may reveal a further level-notably narrative and culture specific representations that are formal. One cannot therefore contextualize Byron’s poetry to the exclusion of narrative and culture since certain historical, cultural and ideological issues relevant for this study’s framework such as post colonialism and Romantic literary values enter the said poetry by means of narrative representations.

Byron’s narrative verse is an example of a sub-genre of poetry that defies generic traditional definitions, if one considers that it constructs the narrative, the Romantic and post colonial issues of subjects, subjectivity and slavery by formal and narrative means. The poetry under analysis offers different degrees of narrative structures, specifically in its engagement with the formal, consciousness categories, voice and mental features of mediation, which, if carefully considered, would be seen as a challenge to the traditional genre notions that usually carry such implications that poetry is an autonomous genre. One needs to emphasize that it covers a broad heterogeneous text corpus ranging from the epic, the lyric, the narrative and even the prose forms exemplified in the reflector mode often associated with twentieth century prose fiction such as Woolf’s To The Lighthouse. It is true that such heterogeneity may create problems for any attempt to contextualize and establish an appropriate framework for its analysis. Nonetheless, reading the poetry under analysis here in the light of its context

23 Genre theory of the lyric argues that there are fundamental differences between poetry and narrative - an argument that has influenced critics attempting to characterise the lyric to focus on specific attributes necessary for categorizing certain texts as poetry. Earlier in the study, we have identified Frye (1963). My point here is that any critical investigation that takes into consideration the fact that Byron appears to have constructed the narrative, the Romantic and the post colonial contexts by formal means would normally step beyond the strictures of generic methodology.
and experimentation with narrative is aimed at revealing both its cultural forms and often ignored narrative aspects.

I am drawing the reader’s attention to the narrative tradition of story telling that featured in Byron’s Romantic poetry written between 1806 and 1823. Henry Bonnet (1978: 6-7) acknowledges narrative transformational changes within mainstream Romantic poetry:

Romanticism is the first poetic revolution, a movement of liberation from a lyricism confined to conventions […]. In a similar way one could distinguish several varieties of poetry […]. From Byron to Whitman, there are many nuances which can be classified by categories […]. It shows that the poetic element as well as the fictional is not limited to one single form.  

More corroborative emphasis comes from Karl Kroeber (1969: 103-104):

Much narrative poetry of the early nineteenth-century led into novelistic conception and techniques […]. The narrative poems of the end of the 18th-C and the beginning of 19th-C operated to transform both the subject and the form of the Augustan novel, worked to enrich its contents and to enlarge its techniques.

Kroeber sees as the results of such experimentation with narrative forms of expression, ‘the establishment of a new form (the lyrical ballad) within the lyric mode [….]’. The introduction of narrative tradition into romantic poetry (a move fostered by Wordsword and Coleridge) is nowhere more evident than in Byron’s poetry. What is clear is that, apart from the fact of bringing together the narrative and poetic material, Byron also rushed into an apparently modern realm hitherto inconceivable in Romantic poetic tradition. This will be illustrated by his adoption of consciousness representation strategies (often emphasized in works of modern prose writers) in his verse.

The specifically ‘novelistic character’ (Kroeber 1966 [1960]: 180) of Byron’s poetry needs to be discussed briefly in view of its centrality for the study’s contextual, theoretical and analytical needs. In the early 19th-century Romantic period, Byron was already

---

24 This applies to Byron’s poetry.
25 Cf. Heather Dubrow (1982: 46-47) and also Jahn (2005: N2.1.4). The roots of narratology or narration are often traced as far back to Plato’s (428-348) and Aristotle’s distinction between ‘mimesis’ (imitation) and ‘diegesis’ (narration). In Book III of the Republic, Plato recognises three methods of presenting a literary work: pure narration (in which the poet speaks in his own voice), narration by imitation (often in tragedies and comedies through one or more speakers), and a mixture of the two. This tradition entered into Romantic poetry through Wordsworth and Coleridge when, in the Lyrical Ballads, they recommended a narrative approach to poetry. Wordsworth specifically questioned the reasons for drawing a line between the language of poetry and that of prose. Plato’s distinctions above appear to have laid the groundwork for a narrative tradition beginning with 18th-century novelists and ranging to 19th-century poets including Byron. Chatman’s (1978) distinction between diegetic narrative (epic narratives, novels, short stories) and what he calls mimetic narrative genres (plays, films, cartoons) is also important and worthy of note.
appropriating and pioneering the fictional (prose) tradition of story telling or narration of action and psychic states in poetry. The range of ways he introduced narrative into poetry is evident in narrative poems such as “The Corsair”, “Lara”, “The Prisoner of Chillon”, “Child Harold’s Pilgrimage”, “Don Juan”, “The Giaour”, “Parisina”, “The Bride of Abydos”, “The Lament of Tasso”, “Beppo”, “Mazeppa”, and “The Prophecy of Dante” among many, in which certain categories of narratorial voice, mental and consciousness representation strategies, cultural categories, metannarative elements, tense devices, focalization clues, and forms of perspective structure can be identified and analyzed. Byron also transformed the stanzaic form of writing poetry into cantos, and thus ushers in narrative issues of plot, and most importantly narration and consciousness representational categories of analyzing textual subjects of meaning-making into the poetic realm. It would appear that for Byron, poetry could no longer retain its traditional generic illusion of rendering meaning only by means of the ‘imaginative, subjective, musical’ and other related forms believed to possess the potential of ‘stressing its expressive value’ (Bonnet 1978: 5). Even the imagination, or the expression of subjective feelings and other poetic elements that transmit poetic meaning through imagery, or by means of ‘musical and pictorial patterns’ (Charles Schug 1979: 13) such as verse, song and metaphors found expression in Byron’s poetry by means of certain techniques similar to what is called the stream of consciousness (or interior monologues broadly elaborated on by Cohn (1978) and other writers, to which we shall return). By choosing to write poetry in the narrative tradition, Byron evinces tenacity for story telling, and thereby bringing the narrative verse into being in his own brand of Romanticism.

It is evident from the contextual explanation that Byron’s narrative verse is largely narrative. It constructs narrative agents, narrating characters and consciousness representation strategies of story telling at almost all levels of narrative communication. What follows from the above argument, then, is the understanding that the category of poetry Byron wrote contains narrative features that trigger the illusion of a narrative tradition. The degree of narrative categories he experimented with provides grounds that enable the study to get beyond the usual limited emphasis in the biographical, comic, epic, Augustan and Romantic traditions in previous descriptions of the corpus. The use of the term ‘verse narrative’ however implies that there are inherent narrative, and poetic motivations for classifying the corpus as such. Hence, in the choice of framework and in its classification, the study takes into consideration the fact that narrative features are largely emphasized.
Most of my examples of the forms and functions of narration and focalization in the poetry of Lord Byron are drawn from the narrative poems indicated above. I have restricted my corpus to narrative poems and other long poems written in monologues. One crucial reason for choosing the narrative verse is that the poems selected for analysis amply incorporate certain features of storytelling or mediation often associated with narrative (prose) fiction, but hardly emphasized in poetry. Curiously texts like “Lara”, “Parisina”, “The Corsair”, for instance, construct focalization and narration. “Lara”, for instance, cannot sustain a single voice as the reader finds the authorial (heterodiegetic) narrator temporarily stepping into the story’s action in homodiegetic style to report his participation in the murder of one of the characters. On its part “The Prisoner of Chillon” (XIV) transforms cultural creatures like spiders and mice into fictive subjects – ‘we’ - and goes beyond merely giving them a linguistic identity to accord them certain narrative roles. These and other poems that engage with additional narrative emphasis will be discussed in detail in the chapters dealing with analysis of poems. At this stage I propose to focus on the state of the art in Byron’s poetry aiming to show that the few narrative-oriented approaches lack a transgeneric narratological orientation and are therefore deficient in answering questions raised in Byron’s narrative verse regarding voice and focalization.

Since the study’s central concern is to make certain categories of narrators and focalizers work theoretically and analytically within the poetic realm, and considering that the selected corpus contains elements that go beyond individual texts and the historical period, it makes sense to see why the study works with different aspects of narrative theory and cultural categories of analysing mediation. In the proceeding section I propose to investigate previous research dealing specifically with questions of mediation in Byron’s poetry. My interest goes beyond merely indicating major directions of inquiry as I intend to pass my own judgements on findings and to indicate new questions and new directions of research where appropriate. The question remains whether this study is the first to demonstrate the fruitfulness of applying a transgeneric narratological terminology in analyzing narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry. To answer such a question, which points toward the study’s

---

26 Although monologues were used during the Victorian literary period after Byron lived and wrote, I use the term as a convenient label for poems that reveal certain aspects of the narrative fictive speaker’s inner life or mental processes in the manner of interior monologues.
contribution to research, an examination of extant literature on Byron’s poetry, specifically those articles that come closer to questions raised by the study, becomes my starting point.

The concern with generic distinctions, biographical influence, and sociological factors has resulted in formal, prosodic, influence- and genre-oriented readings with the results that a transgeneric focus on the study of narration and focalization has not been accorded much attention by critics working on Byron’s poetry. Such traditionally oriented readings which call for attention here have motivated the study to engage in identifying the narrative aspects of Byron’s poetry that remain largely unappreciated. Such an attempt is intended to highlight features of narration and focalization that previous studies on Byron’s narrative verse have often ignored or simply stated in passing. A few selections dealing with some of the poems under examination, preceded by the state of theory in poetic criticism, would help clarify the border line between this project, and what exists in poetry criticism as well as work on Byron’s poetry from a narratological position.

My claim that an analysis of narration and focalization has so far not received sufficient attention in Byron’s poetry can only find corroborative evidence when one examines the few studies that are devoted to these topics or that just mention narration and focalization axiomatically. As will be noticed, some existing studies focusing on narration and focalization in the poetry of Byron have not paid sufficient attention to the categories of authorial narration, homodiegetic narration, the reflector mode, perspective strategies, tense categories, metannative features, cultural categories of voice (communal voice, personal voice) and the role of imagery, and other consciousness representation features. Neither have they considered the various strategies of focalization which may be analyzed to conform to my hypothesis that narratology can be fruitfully applied to Byron’s narrative poetry. De Jong’s (2001: 70) concern about the negligence of critics when it comes to focusing on ways of discussing figural narration27 in Homeric prose, and a similar concern of Hühn’s (2004: 40), who criticizes traditional narratologists for denying poetry narrative categories they had

---

27 Cf. de Jong’s (2001: 70) remark that historically speaking, Stanzel has located the surfacing of figural narration as thematic development in literature in the 19th century specifically in the wake of psychological notions of the subconscious. She continues to explain that the process received emphasis in the 20th century through the work of Freud. In her opinion, it is logical that a narrative technique that makes a reader see events through the eyes or consciousness of a character is bound to flourish when so much is known about the human mind. The issue raised by Stanzel (1971) and echoed by de Jong is not only that of the late invention of the figural technique, but also its lack of application in narrative texts written before more was known about the human psyche. Along the same lines, I would argue that any curious reader who bases his classification or contextualization of Byron’s poetry not solely on generic norms would realise that Byron’s poetry cuts across generic borders incorporating aspects similar to those associated with modern prose, the figural or reflector mode being a lucid example.
restricted ‘exclusively to the analysis of narrative prose fiction’, turn out to reflect the very restrictions this study finds both in poetry criticism as well as in extant literature on Byron’s poetry. Adopting specifically Hühn’s (2004: 40) observation that poetry and narrative have been viewed as incompatible genres resulting in a concern with internal elements that signalize poetry, this study finds grounds to challenge critics of Byron’s poetry of being silent on the role of features such as narration and focalization. Curiously, no studies on Byron’s poetry or narrative verse have yet provided an intensive theoretical survey that subsumes the authorial (heterodiegetic), the first-person homodiegetic forms, the figural mode in its first- and third-person contexts, communal and personal voices, focalization, perspective, and other consciousness representation categories of analyzing narration and focalization. The few studies and some axiomatic observations seeking to compare or analyze Byron’s narrative verse against the background of novelistic tradition have concentrated on such aspects as satire, picaresque features, structural unity, and Byronic heroic traits of character. As one example of such readings, Andras Horn’s (1962) comparison of “Don Juan” with 18th century novels of Fielding, Sterne and Smollet focuses on satire, subjectivity (biography) and picaresque elements, respectively. The list is not exhaustive.

Evidently, the readings cited in the footnote below have in one way or another relied either on the internal structure of poems or on theories of authorship featuring closer convergence with Old Historicism, New Historicism (Greenblatt: 1988) and Formalist orientations with the result that some of the narrative tendencies of Byron’s poetry are often ignored. Those offering biographical readings including Elfenbein (1995) have been interested in the personality of Byron, and have concentrated on making comparisons of different works. The result is that such readings have often capitalized on linguistic, formal and thematic emphasis about the Augustan and Romantic periods, and the impact on Byron’s poetry. However, a cross section of some readings has focused directly on the narrative aspects of Byron’s poetry to which we now turn our attention.

---

28 Other categories such as unreliable narrators, implied author, narratee, addressee, authorial audience etc. are equally relevant approaches in looking at narrative mediation and can be analysed further in Byron’s poetry.

Karl Kroeber (1966) has been concerned with the possible ways Byron and other Romantic poets experimented with narrative. One of his essays from *Romantic Narrative Art* (1966) focusing on “Don Juan” bears witness to this point of view. Analyzing “Don Juan” as a ‘novel in verse’ (159), the ‘precursor of a new kind of novel writing’, or even as a poem that anticipated 19th-century novels in its ‘new style’ and ‘new form’ (160), Kroeber (1969) identifies the narrative element as a remarkable feature of the poem’s novelistic tendencies:

It is a long narrative in verse, [...] much more persuasive is the tendency of modern critics to describe “Don Juan” as a novel [...]. It must be judged as a novel [...]. Many spurious continuations of “Don Juan” are novelistic in character [...]. Much narrative poetry of the early nineteenth century led into novelistic conceptions and techniques. We are committed to viewing “Don Juan” as a novel in verse [...] a precursor of a new kind of novel writing. (103-104)

Significantly, Kroeber maintains that “Don Juan” belongs to ‘that development that operated to transform both the subject and the form of the Augustan Novel’ in its contents and range of techniques. Tracing the corollary between the Romantic form and the fictional one further, Kroeber concludes that perspective or point of view (what he considers the narrative) is constructed in Byron’s poetry. What Kroeber says about “Don Juan” is equally true of other narrative poems Byron wrote. His references to ‘novelistic’, ‘perspective’, and his particular emphasis that “Don Juan” is written in the ‘new style’ of 19th-century fiction can be assumed to mean that the poem contains narrative features often associated with modern prose - a statement that will be taken seriously both theoretically and in analysis.

Analyzing both “Don Juan” and “Lara” as narratives, Kroeber (1973) points out that features such as protagonist, a complicated network of social relations, picaresque elements, narrative episodes, biographical details, realism, satire, and the colloquial mode can be identified as evidence of the poem’s indebtedness to the 18th-century Augustan novel as well as it being a precursor or forerunner of 19th-century prose fiction. In the light of Fielding’s and other 18th-century novelists like Smollet, Kroeber’s conclusions that the above narrative features constitute intersecting grounds between Byron’s poetry and the 18th and 19th century narrative traditions cannot be disputed. There is no doubt that such terms as perspective, point of view and prose affirms the fundamental narrative dimensions of Byron’s poetry. Yet, Kroeber does not investigate narrative voice (‘who speaks’), focalization (‘who sees’) and most importantly the figurative narrative techniques that the application of such terms as ‘narrative’, ‘novelistic’ and ‘prose’ often invoke. In addition, no evidence shows that the techniques Kroeber analyses in “Don Juan” and “Lara” in connection with both the English
novel and modern prose fiction contain the same aspects of narration and focalization this study intends to investigate.

Like Kroeber, other critics have been concerned to analyze the relation of Byron’s poetry to the narrative tradition. Edward Bostetter (1969) acknowledges in passing the novelistic tendencies of “Don Juan”. Attempting, as Kroeber has done, to analyze the relationship of some of Byron’s poems to the 18th century tradition of the English novel, Andras Horn (1962) identifies satire, social morality and epic or picaresque qualities. Thus, where Kroeber and Horn stop at acknowledging certain aspects of narrative and themes found in the poetry of Byron, this study moves past style toward a more theoretical focus emphasizing the role of focalization and certain categories of narrators as evidence of features of narrative tradition in Byron’s poetry.

Although it is apparent that narrative critics have paid less attention to features of the narrative tradition in Byron’s narrative verse, some consideration has been given to narrative aspects which are linked to focalization and narrative. The most extensive examination of Byron’s verse narrative and monologues comes from Jane Kirchner (1973). Kirchner’s emphasis is on the various forms and uses of the persona in the oriental tales. In her analysis of some of Byron’s verse tales, Kirchner points out that the narratives and monologues are told by different agents in such labels as narrator, ‘I’, poet-narrator, (45; 176) and the narrator-protagonist. All these distinctions go a long way to generating the amount of evidence needed to demonstrate the various self-revealing strategies by which the persona of the tales can be identified and analyzed. Her emphasis on the content of the tales and on the Byronic figure modes rather than on narrative techniques gives the impression that biographical consideration is at the basis of her discussion of the persona figure. Interestingly, her categories are relevant for this study as they provide a considerable scope for discussing certain levels of textual voices and type of narrative situation and may contribute to answering questions regarding narrative mediation in poetry. Nonetheless, Kirchner’s categories of speech agents are discussed in relation to their actions, heroic traits of character, and thematic functions, and hence exclude the narrative criteria for the description and analysis of narrative aspects of the poems she examines. The vague references to protagonist, poet-narrator, narrator and Byronic hero do not tell us anything about narration. Further, there is disregard for the categories by which they can be systematized, differentiated from one another and

30 A similar reading from Jean-Paul Forster’s (1991: 80-88) article, “1814-1819 Shift of Focalization in Byron’s Narrative Poems.”
analyzed in terms of textual functions. The issues discussed above let the reader see the limits in Kirchner’s elaborate discussion of the persona figure in the tales and monologues in comparison to the systematic distinctions offered by this study. The full significance of her use of the above categories will be discussed in systematic conceptual terms later on in the study.

Jean-Paul Forster (1991: 80-88) has analyzed focalization in Byron’s poetry although narrative categories that are apt to answer the question of who sees, perceives, or dreams, (the criteria often considered within narratological conceptualizations of focalization, as we shall see in due course) appear not to have been his concern. Forster’s concerns at first sight are similar to certain aspects of focalization analyzed in this study. Forster uses focalization as a mode of analyzing the different appearances of the Byronic hero in certain narrative poems in order to explicate what he calls ‘refiguration’ (also understood to mean self-expression). The techniques he uses to account for the various forms of self-expression assumed by the different Byronic heroes of some of Byron’s narrative poems include the variation of narrative perspective, scenic presentations, heroic traits of character, and focalization of the segment of a hero’s life. The poems Forster has analyzed in this respect reveal aspects of the characters that are often regarded as Byronic heroic tendencies. The techniques of focalization Forster uses to explain the various aspects of ‘refiguration’ reveal no connection with the verbs of perception, subject matter, deictics or ‘mind style’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 123). All viewing and perceiving frames (Fludernik 1996) and ‘psychoanalogies’ (Cohn 1978) provided by narratology for the analysis of focalization, and which this study also relies on to construct the perceptions of the narrator and characters in Byron’s poetic texts are not considered by Forster.

In another reading, focusing on structure, Patricia Ball (1968: 29) analyses “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage III” as a long ‘monologic’ discourse, shapeless, plotless, and liberated from the constraints of narrative sequencing. Ball’s statement can be assumed to mean that the poem does not contain narrative elements. Ball’s position that the poem is plotless finds narrative justification in events where scenic imagery (especially in lyric passages) reflects the protagonist’s thoughts or mode of feelings. In this light, there is a sense in which such a reading understands certain fragments of the cantos to be linked to thought processes, a technique narrative critics have assigned to interior monologues. Nevertheless, such an interpretation that Ball assigns to the poem as monologue has little in common with the linguistic, consciousness categories and perceptual strategies (for analyzing authorial
narration, homodiegetic narration, the figural mode) by which narration and focalization are constructed in Byron’s poems.

Like the narrators of “Don Juan” and “Beppo” who have overtly referred to their poems as ‘narrative’ and ‘prose’ respectively, Francis Doherty (1968: 58), Bostetter (1969: 103) and Frye (1963: 178) do recognize the often acknowledged novelistic character of Byron’s narrative verse, though in passing. Nonetheless, such claims generate part of the very reasons for my attempts to demonstrate that if the novelistic and hence story element is present as evidence of narrative, then the narrators, narrating characters, and focalizers are unavoidably present in the poems.

When M. G. Cooke (1969: 42; 56) describes “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” III as ‘the fragmentary shapes of order’ (38), which he blames on random characterization and imagery, he (in a footnote) cites Kenneth Bruffee who refuses to admit that Byron ‘consciously pioneered a modern narrative technique’ (42). Bruffee’s observation as provided by M. G. Cooke requires attention here because it erroneously challenges and even denies the figural mode the place it deserves in Byron’s narrative verse. Had Bruffee considered poems like “Lara”, “The Corsair” and “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage”, which construct a range of narrative techniques relevant for internal focalization, free indirect thought and other techniques that may appropriately represent consciousness, he would probably not have doubted Byron’s experimentation with the modern figural technique. Such an argument is, however, also recognition of Byron’s experiment with techniques for representing thoughts\(^{31}\) in poetic texts to which we shall return considering their centrality for the study’s analysis of narrative transmission.

Despite the presence of narrative elements in Byron’s poetry specifically those dealing with questions of narrative transmission, an analysis of narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry is still largely ignored by critics. The readings cited above bear testimony to my argument that the corpus chosen for analysis has so far not been accompanied by sufficient narrative theoretical orientation. Even those studies concerned with narrative aspects of Byron’s verse narrative have shown no relation to figural narrative mode, authorial (heterodiegetic), first person (homodiegetic), narrating subjects or animals, communal voice, perspective, collective consciousness, levels of focalization, and the range of narrative

\(^{31}\) See Dorrit Cohn (1978) for a discussion of narrative techniques for representing mental states in fiction in general.
techniques for representing consciousness in poetry by which the forms and functions of narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry can be accounted for. In addition, the reader’s role, metanarrative commentaries, and tense categories appear to have been largely ignored in the analysis of narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry and may constitute fertile grounds for further investigation. By saying that the above studies did not provide absolute answers to questions dealing with narrative communication, one is also pointing towards areas of emphasis largely ignored in extant literature on Byron’s narrative verse. What else then could have motivated the writing of this thesis if not the attempt to fill the existing critical gap left by reviewers of Byron’s poetry, in the hope of contributing to literature and poetry in particular in ways that are as yet unfamiliar?

However, to say that critics have paid insufficient attention to narrative features of voice and focalization in Byron’s narrative poetry is neither to claim that narratologists have failed to take note of the relationship between narrative theory and poetry nor that they have provided no narratological concepts for the analysis of poetry. This section critically investigates recent theoretical approaches to poetry in order to emphasize their contribution to the clarification of the problem of how narration and focalization enter the poetic text raised by this study. Further complementary steps would constitute an attempt to make clear the usefulness and restrictions of narrative theory of poetry in view of the theoretical gaps that this study seeks to address. In doing so, the study attempts to provide an innovative synthesized transgeneric narratological approach to poetry that integrates categories of voice, tense aspects, narrative strategies, imagery, perspective, non-human objects, consciousness and perceptual strategies as well as other narratological forms to account for the poetic uses of narration and focalization in Byron’s works.

One of the recent moves in the field of narratology has been the attempt to make narrative theory more useful not only in solving problems in narrative (prose) fiction 32 but

---

32 Cf. Hühn and Schönert (2005: 2). See also Hühn’s approach to poetry criticism “Transgeneric Narratology” (2004) and also his specific emphasis that theoretical foundations of poetry criticism are increasingly criticized as deficient, its analytical categories and procedures criticized as intuitive and lacking systematic organisation (2005). Apparently echoing Hühn’s point of view on the state of the arts in poetry criticism, Werner Wolf (2005: 32) regrets that as yet, most approaches to the lyric tend to be normative, are based on the ‘conceptualization of the lyric as a fixed essence, which can be defined by one or very few necessary features’; an understanding he says has led to the ‘privileging of versification’ or ‘unmediated’ subjectivity as ‘defining and essential qualities of the lyric, thus excluding prose poems or ballads […]’. This study joins Hühn and Schönert (2005: 1), Werner Wolf (2005), and Fludernik (1996) both in theory and practice to suggest that the state of poetry criticism could be remedied by drawing on insights into theoretical and methodological foundations of approaches to narrative mediation and focalization provided by classical and post-classical narratologists including Genette, Chatman, Stanzel, Cohn, Fludernik, O’Neill, Bal, Ansgar Nünning, Lanser, to name but a few.
also to use it to account for the analysis of narrative structures in other areas like poetry (which, in Hühn’s (2005: 2) opinion ‘is notoriously lacking in theoretical foundation’) in the hope that poetry can benefit from the broad, systematic, and differentiated concepts provided by narratology to account for mediacy of narrative transmission. Such an attempt has proceeded from the assumption that there are analogies between narrative (prose) fiction and poetry. Although genre and post modern poetic approaches dealing with speech agents differ substantially from the purely narratological ones in view of their restricted emphasis on categories of speech agents, they, however, deserve mention here because they do contribute to shaping the framework of this project in some way. It is to these and other theories of poetry that raise questions of voice that we will pay attention first.

One of the postmodern theorists who has touched (though slightly) on certain forms of voice representations in poetic discourse is Werner Wolf (2005). Although he deals basically with generic models and analytical categories for discussing the lyric, he raises pertinent issues that are central to the study’s concern with forms and functions of certain categories of speech agents in narrative transmission. This concerns basically the cognitive-prototypical aspects of mental states which he considers as one of the generic features of the lyric. While conceding that lyric features enter the fictional mind through mental experiences and perceptions that necessarily display ‘family resemblance’, Werner Wolf goes further to suggest the centrality of sender and recipient at the communication level. In addition to the emphasis on sender and recipient which also suggests voice, Werner Wolf proposes the phenomena of unmediated consciousness, imagery and mental states as contents of the mind. Her discussion of these prototypical features cannot be dispensed with, owing to their connection with modes of representing consciousness. It should be argued, however, that although Werner Wolf uses the terms mental experiences and consciousness in the restricted sense of the lyric and encourages an interpretation that lyric poetry does not construct external narrating agents and levels or external developments and actions, but a single consciousness (monologic utterance), the same forms can be adopted and refined for a discussion of the reflector mode since such subjective forms are the very means by which this narrative mode discloses itself in a narrative text. I am also drawing attention to the fact that subjectivity

33 For more details on the analogies that can be established between narrative fiction and poetry, see Hühn and Schönert (2005). Without attempting to blur the distinction between the two discourses, one needs to emphasize that the use of narratology to construct narration and focalization in poetry could become productive for both disciplines. What I am saying is that the application of narratological categories to the description of poetic features is incompatibile only when the purely lyric features (song, rhythm, versification, etc.) and not narrative poetry like the ballad or epic are considered.
manifests itself differently in different narrative situations and enters the poetic texts through many forms including imagery, language, and mental patterns and should not be seen exclusively as a lyric generic trait as genre theorists have tried to demonstrate. In arguing as such, I am proposing subjectivity as another component of perspective and focalization which needs to be refined to be integrated into a transgeneric approach to the study of mediation in poetry analysis.

Another early narratological intervention in poetic discussions was provided by van der Poel (1990 [1986: 573]): the narrative device of autobiographical narrator – the lyrical I. Drawing on “Roman de la Rose”, van der Poel points out that the protagonist’s ‘actions’ constitute evidence of the presence of the ‘I’ of the poem. From van der Poel's analysis, the reader’s attention is directed to one important narrative feature: the story’s ‘action’ sentences appear to assume a central role in the identification of the protagonist or narrator of the text – the lyrical I, a construct that is also important for a narratological analysis of autobiographical texts.

Abad-Garcia (2005) takes a further step in dealing with narration as a generic marker as seen in her postmodern genre theory of poetry. In Abad-Garcia’s opinion, postmodern genre theory ‘emphasizes on generic ‘impurity’ […]’ (265), description, and on the reconceptualization of generic universals as modes (of discourse or speech), i.e., as linguistic categories […], and therefore qualify as a ‘most suitable scientific foundation for dealing with lyric discourses’ (265). The postmodern lyric, according to Abad-Garcia (265), is a victim of generic impurity, implicit in its ‘polyphonic’ (and dialogical) overtones. The impression generated by Abad-Garcia’s approach is that the lyric genre is a discourse or a linguistic-communicative realm where generic transformation (265) is signaled by features that are narrative. Abad-Garcia (274) continues to explain that generic constituents of discourse or speech events that are narrative in nature may help in the analysis of generically hybrid poems (which usually undergo a blurring process), and thus offers an opportunity to distinguish lyric subjects in action as narrators, focalizers, personae, and lyric voice. If Wolf’s (2005) approach appears restricted in terms of issues dealing with conceptualization of narratorial voice, Abad-Garcia’s, offers a broader expansion relevant for this study. Even though she emphasizes more on postmodern genre theories, and on linguistic aspects, her genre-oriented categories such as narrator and focalizer can be applicable in this study. Interestingly, she identifies generic constituents that are narrative. The narrative categories she proposes for discussions of poetry that are relevant for this study comprise speaking subject, the addressee, and the
communicative situation or speech acts that are analogous to the stream of consciousness. Of particular importance are her categories of first-person and third-person speakers, which are also important for discourse representations and can function as analytical devices to account for narration in both poetry and narrative texts. The categories of speaking subjects, narrators, focalizers, and speech acts proposed by Abad Garcia for the analysis of generic features that are narrative can be systematized to become useful strategies in analyzing narrative mediation. Nevertheless, a closer look at Abad-Garcia’s categories reveals a concern with defining features of lyric subjectivity. Besides, it should be pointed out that the existence of a linguistic feature alone can neither guarantee an understanding of the typology or category of focalization nor narrative situation to which the element belongs. In addition, Abad-Garcia’s narrative categories do not shed light on the level and mode of textual manifestation the particular aspect assumes in the narrative text.

While genre theory of the lyric and even certain postmodern poetic theories privilege generic classifications, Hühn (2004) apparently unprecedentedly shifts focus from an isolated consideration of generic descriptions to providing a more systematic narrative theory of poetry that aims at making poetry benefit from the terminology of transgeneric narratology in both conceptual and analytical terms. Challenging traditional narrative theory and also the more recent narrative theories of fiction that restrict their focus to the analysis of narrative (prose) fiction as the one genre essentially defined by the device of story telling, Hühn (2004: 140) brings into poetry criticism the insights of narratology. His aim is to provide a groundbreaking theoretical approach to poetry called transgeneric narratology. Suggesting that poetry has a link with narrative fiction, Hühn emphasizes sequentiality, and articulation and mediacy as the points where affinities between the lyric and narrative fiction can be discerned and explored.

In his theory of mediacy, Hühn introduces narratology into poetry criticism to account for the needs of, (in analytical terms), the theory of poetry. The apparently new insight in his transgeneric approach to poetry is mediation. For the first time in poetry criticism, Hühn introduces mediacy - a typology that subsumes certain categories of narrators and forms of perspective including focalization. In developing a narrative approach to poetry, Hühn offers the discipline of poetry an opportunity to discuss narrative features of voice and focalization in reference to conceptual and analytical terms. As shall be discussed later, Hühn’s categories of agents of mediation and levels of perspective (which subsumes voice and focalization) are structuralist oriented and mark the extent to which his transgeneric approach to mediacy can
contribute to answer questions about voice and focalization in poetry. Since a systematic account of how the textual forms of certain categories of narrators and of types of focalizers can ‘provide new interpretive methods for practical analysis of poems’ (Hühn 2004: 140) is central to this study, it is crucial to examine Hühn’s approach to poetry because it deals directly with issues of mediation.

Arguing that a description of the structure of narrative transmission would be incomplete without the specification of ‘the forms and entities that mediate the happenings on the level of presentation’, Hühn (2004) and also Hühn and Schönert (2005: 8) propose four categories of narrators to analyze mediating agents in narrative transmission in the context of lyric poetry. These constitute the empirical or biographical author (understood as producer of a text), the abstract author (composing subject or implied author), the speaker (narrator), and the protagonist (character).

Interestingly, Hühn takes a step away from merely postulating agents and levels of mediation to providing criteria by which these categories could be differentiated in poetic texts. His argument is that the distinction between the textual subject and personalized speaker is dependent on interpretation and has to be determined on the basis of attribution. A further criterion, according to Hühn (2004: 148), which is at the same time ‘a notorious problem’ connected with the distinction between these four categories of narrators named above, concerns the question of the narrator’s reliability and unreliability. According to Hühn, this criterion is relevant because in poetry different conventions apply to different narrators. Hühn’s (2004: 148) opinion is that homodiegetic and autodiegetic narrators are likely to be considered potentially unreliable. He takes his argument further by pointing out that in contrast to heterodiegetic narrators who do not raise doubts, readers of poems with dramatized speakers apparently are not normally inclined to question the veracity of the statements. He, however, attributes the lack of studies on (un)reliability in poetic texts to the fact that most lyric poems spoken by first-person speakers tend to present a subjective view which is never subjected to the question of (un)reliability. He concludes that raising the question of (un)reliability within lyric poems, defined by specific relations between the speaker’s and the textual subject’s perspective. To him, this may allow for a more differentiated analysis of the conditions and manifestations of subjectivity (148).34

34 For more on (un)reliability as narrative category, see Wayne Booth (1961), Meindl (2004), and Nünning/Nüning (2004). Note however that unlike the other critics, Booth assigns this category of distinction to the first person context only.
Another category and criterion for the discussion of mediacy is - according to Hühn (2004: 142; 143; 146) and Hühn and Schönert (2005: 8) - based on two types of perspectives:\(^{35}\) the distinction between voice and focalization.\(^{36}\) Hühn and Schönert (2005: 8) define voice as the agent responsible for the language used in the text, the verbal utterance (‘who speaks’), while focalization points towards the position that perception and cognition are ascribed to as the deictic center of perception as well as cognitive, psychological, and ideological focus on the incidents (‘who sees?’, or rather, ‘who perceives?’). Hühn (2005: 147-172) goes further and proposes the categories of narrating and experiencing self as useful criteria for making distinctions in homodiegetic and autodiegetic discourse in the event where there is coincidence of voice and focalization.

A further relevant distinction Hühn discusses within focalization concerns the case of retrospective homodiegetic narration. What is worthy of note is the fact that, within this mode, the subtle distance between the narrating and experiencing (perceiving or reflecting) self typically occurs, which is indeed a difference that can be accounted for by means of cognitive and emotional strategies of narrative. To support his argument, Hühn cites simultaneous narration, understood as a technique by which there is a congruence of the perspective of speaker and protagonist (narrator and character discourse) as well as the coincidence of voice and focalization often very typical of first-person texts narrated in the present tense. Hühn’s (2005: 149) textual criteria for discussing simultaneous narration in poetic texts include the use of present tense and first-person pronouns. This study will build on Hühn’s criteria (but will also propose to add to the range of strategies of focalization imagery, free indirect discourse and other mental forms to account for perception) to construct levels of focalization in Byron’s poetry in order to permit an understanding of their functions.

---

\(^{35}\) Adopting Hühn’s (2004: 149) opinion, perspective is not conceived here as a synonym for the controversial issue of ‘point of view’, but as term to account for the different basic modes of presenting objects, persons, and situations including perceptual experiencing strategies of focalization. See also Bal (1985) for a similar explanation.

\(^{36}\) Cf. Bal’s opinion (1985: 101) that any discussion on focalization begins with a distinction between perception (the vision through which the elements are presented) and voice (the identity of the teller that is verbalizing the vision). I use the term ‘focalization’ in this study to include all ‘viewing and perceptual frames’ (Fludernik: 1996), and also imagery that could be important for accounting for the textual agent that perceives an event. This implies that I neither intend to restrict the terminology to mode and vision as Genette (1988 [1980]), has originally understood, nor to make focalization an element of story only as Chatman (1986; 1978) and Prince (2001). For contributions on focalization see Genette (1988 [1980]), O’Neill (1994), Rimmon-Kenan (1983), Fludernik (1996), Suzanne Fleischman (1990), Jacob Lothe (2000), Gerald Prince (2001), Manfred Jahn (2005) and others we shall examine in due course.
Hühn and Schönert’s model of mediacy is particularly relevant for this study in view of its concern with problems of narratorial voice and focalization. Notwithstanding the fact that the model lacks the categorical scope offered by this study, it constitutes an almost unprecedented contribution that deploys narratology in poetry criticism, and appears to be a challenge to genre theory of poetry with its narrow emphasis on lyric-specific features amongst which subjectivity and speech acts have often been proposed. What is particularly helpful about the transgeneric narrative poetic approach to mediation is that it offers systematic parameters to analyse poetic representations of mediating agents and levels. The new insight offered by Hühn’s categories of voice and focalization is particularly indispensable in view of its systematic distinctions between homodiegetic and autodiegetic narrations. This distinction is useful for the analysis of both focalization and the figural mode in first-person texts which sometimes constructs a homodiegetic narrator (both the agent that saw and the one that narrates are the same person) moving under two separate identities as we will see later on. Any attempt to find more systematic answers to questions concerning narrative voice in poetry can find partial solutions in the narrative categories of biographical author, the empirical author, the speaker/narrator, and the protagonist/character. The model as such provides a differentiated approach to explore narrative categories a reader can deploy to analyze voice and perception in a narrative text. In view of its apparent affinities (mediation and story telling) with narrative fiction, Byron’s verse tales can arguably benefit from Hühn’s systematic typology. Nevertheless, the degree of usefulness of Hühn’s categories of narrators and focalizers discussed above becomes insufficient when applied to narrative verse as a whole, considering that narrative verse is not of the same text class as lyric poetry since it constructs further levels such as homodiegetic, autodiegetic, heterodiegetic, and reflector characters in both first and third-person texts. Like the categories of speaking agents, those that Hühn proposes for analyzing levels of perspective like simultaneous narration and retrospective narration are also inadequate in a context like narrative verse which constructs both internal and external levels of focalization hardly emphasized in lyric texts. Consequently, the range of categories of speaking agents and forms of perspective make the model of transgeneric narratology relevant only for certain and not all poetic texts that construct narrators and focalizers.

It is clear from arguments above that Hühn’s categories of voice and perspective offer a quite restricted solution to the problem of narration and focalization in poetry criticism. The omissions in Hühn’s model, such as authorial (heterodiegetic) narrative situation, first-person (homodiegetic) form, the figural or reflector mode, communal and collective consciousness,
tense aspects, narratee indicators as well as mental forms of constructing focalization are the reason for a proposal to include into transgeneric narratology other relevant approaches from classical and post-classical narratology in the hope of providing a more comprehensive approach for investigating issues of voice and focalization\(^{37}\) in poetry. I am thus raising the point that the question whether or not Hühn’s transgeneric narratology can provide sufficient insight for answering questions dealing with mediation in remains to be addressed.

For the purpose of this study, it is obvious from existing approaches to poetry that there are yet unanswered questions regarding a cross-disciplinary study of narrative transmission. While one needs to raise awareness of the growing interest in storytelling by Byron, one is at the same time evoking the crucial issue of developing an extensive and synthesized framework that may satisfy its multidimensional needs in the light of mediacy. Granted, as we have said, that the verse narrative transcends generic boundaries or even historical periods implicit in its range of narrating agents, one may need to examine whether concepts drawn from classical and post-classical theories of mediation may be synthesized into a single approach in order to provide a more dynamic transgeneric narratological approach to poetry analysis.

Before any such attempt is undertaken, the point needs to be reiterated that since the central aim of this study is to analyze the forms and uses of narrating agents and focalization (which may be located in images, mental patterns, voice and objects in the same way as in character-narrators) in poetry, it makes sense to see why the specific methods of narrative mediation provided by Kirchner, Abad-Garcia, and Hühn may be deficient and need considerable modification and synthesis. In addition, narrative verse differs from pure poetry at the level of storytelling. Such an explanation also points towards the emphasis that judgements we make about any narrative genre also determine decisions about concepts and methods suitable for their analysis. In view of the above, we now turn briefly to propose the methodology by which the integration process would proceed.

---

\(^{37}\) This is, however, not to say Hühn’s categories are relevant only within the lyric. Hühn proposed restricted categories of voice and perspective perhaps to account for mediation in the lyric for which he developed his approach, and whose emphasis on the subjectivity and monologic speakers denies it the range of speakers one finds in other subgenres like Byron’s verse tales. Notwithstanding the fact that Hühn had different research goals, my argument is that it seems unjustified to cast poetry into the approximate scope of narrative (prose) fiction in the dimension of sequentiality, articulation and, in particular, mediacy as Hühn has expressly emphasized and yet limits its range of categories of speakers and those of analysing focalization. Still, excluding the figural mode and its textual mental categories leaves further questions unanswered. In view of these considerations this study proposes an inclusion of further categories of narrators and focalization in Hühn’s approach to mediacy.
The methodology for my research is descriptive, analytical, and interpretive and involving a synthesis of approaches or relevant concepts from classical and post-classical theories of mediation, aiming to show the various forms of narration and focalization that link transgeneric narratology and cultural narratology. In doing so, I will also attempt to demonstrate that linguistic evidence, voice categories, non-human objects, consciousness forms, perceptual devices, focalization, and perspective clues can, for reasons that they perform similar functions of narrative representations be brought together into an integrated approach. The study as such proposes to make a synthesis of approaches to narrative mediation and focalization developed and modified by Genette (1988 [1983], 1980), Chatman (1986; 1990a), Rimmon-Kenan (1983), Stanzel (1971), Lanser (1992), Cohn (1978), O’Neil (1994), Palmer (2002), Hühn (2004), Hühn and Schönert (2005), Fleischman (1990), Ansgar Nünning (2000; 2001; 2004a; 2004b) and others. We now turn briefly to the process of integration.

With the exception of Hühn’s approach, which covers certain issues regarding mediacy, nothing appears to have been said hitherto in poetry criticism about the possibility of conceptualizing a narratologically informed transgeneric approach that integrates concepts from other research areas for poetic discussion. Considering the extent to which certain poetic subcategories transgress the boundaries of generic limitations, poetry in general can no longer be contained by generic borderlines. Poetry therefore requires a description based not only on generic markers, nor on purely structuralist narrative phenomena, but rather on a combination of concepts. Considering the relevance of voice categories, culture specific representations of mediating agents, communal voice, levels of perspective, focalization, metannative devices, narrative techniques for representing consciousness and tense categories for this study, they could be brought into a synthesis in order to foregrounding the interrelationship of transgeneric narratology with narrative insights provided by cultural narratology in order to show that these approaches intersect. In addition, this synthesis will offer new research questions and new insights into transgeneric narratology. The nature and scope of the above argument is an indication that I claim not to postulate or develop an unprecedented approach, but to integrate the approaches to poetry dealing directly or indirectly with narrative transmission in order to provide a more innovative transgeneric narrative approach to poetry analysis.

Notwithstanding the fact that transgeneric narrative theory and cultural narratology are identified within different research areas and different aims and goals evident in their
methodological discrepancies (often arising from divergent definitions) the project may not be restricted in terms of choice of model or school of thought. The manner in which the verse narrative constructs stories requires for its analysis an approach that assimilates narrative devices from both narrative theory and cultural narratology so that they can inform and illuminate each other. Genette’s categories of homodiegetic and heterodiegetic narrators, and also, focalization, broadly defined and differentiated by other narratologists have proved useful tools for discussing narrative mediation. Stanzel’s (1971) narrative situations, which constitute the authorial, first person homodiegetic, and the figural mode, are particularly prioritized by this study. The figural mode and consciousness representation strategies (hardly emphasized in theories of poetry) for which Cohn (1978) and also Palmer (2002) may be credited in view of the elaborate differential, descriptive, and analytical strategies they have provided are useful. While Fleischman (1990) and Paul Ricoeur (1995 [1984]) are particularly useful for proposing narrative means of integrating tense categories into narratological discussions, Moshe Ron (1981), Fludernik (1996), Rimmon-Kenan (1983) and Lothe (2000), to mention a few, cannot be left out in discussions regarding textual strategies of focalization.

In an attempt to answer the crucial question of what narratology can do that cultural narratology is apt to do as well, Helmes (2004), and Ansgar Nünning’s (2000; 2001) approach to cultural history, and specifically his emphasis on the concepts of perspective structure, focalization, characters, and narrator shall be relevant in determining how context issues and ideology (see issues of post colonialism, subjects, subjection and Romantic tendencies all constructed in Byron’s poetry) are located in narrative structures. These and other narrative approximate forms of voice and focalization developed in different narrative approaches shall be combined to make transgeneric narratology more integrative and useful for constructing both contexts and narrative meaning (authorial narration, first-person narration, figural narration, focalization, the Romantic literary culture and post colonial ideologies of subject and subjection) in Byron’s poetry. The above strategies will be subsumed under Hühn’s transgeneric narrative approach to mediation. Such an approach might be a response to Ansgar Nünning (2000, 2004a, 2004b) and Helmes (2004) attempts at integrating cultural, ideological and social issues into narratology (though this intimation may hardly offer a satisfactory answer in the present contribution).

It is clear from the above explanations that the study’s central aim is to show if and how transgeneric narratological terminology of mediacy is fruitful in discussing narration and focalization in poetry. In an attempt to answer such a question, chapter two will attempt to make a synthesis of approaches from post classical narratology and transgeric narratology and
will go further to propose narrative categories for analyzing narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry. Considering that there is a relationship of affinities between narrative and culture, voice representation strategies, the perceptual, perspective, consciousness representation forms, and speech categories\(^{38}\), as well as their strategies of identification and analysis shall be synthesized into an integrative and comprehensive approach for analyzing forms and functions of narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry. Since the study’s theoretical procedure aims to show the relevance of mediacy for a discussion of ways in which Byron’s texts may function to yield certain effects, a further section of chapter two will answer the question of which categories of differentiation and analysis may be relevant for an analysis of narration and focalization in poetry. The further question of which textual strategies signal the chosen categories cannot be dispensed with because it is the presence of specific features of narrative that would enable the study to discuss the functions of certain categories of narrators in poetry. A range of typological and corresponding strategies (both linguistic and extralinguistic) shall be evolved to guide such an understanding. The first phase of the theoretical chapter leads from an examination and indication of the limits of traditional approaches to poetry while emphasizing questions left unanswered. Another concern involves a synthesis of approaches to mediation and takes the form of drawing on insights of the narrative approaches to mediacy from Structuralist, post-Structuralist and cultural history. Specifically, it will draw on those approaches that can be useful for the construction of contexts and textual agents of meaning making aiming to integrate into the concept of mediacy certain linguistic and culture specific interrelated strategies of narration and focalization often ignored in poetry criticism. This is the point at which the intersection of approaches dealing with narrative mediation is established. In the next part of the theory chapter, the project shall first of all engage in proposing strategies of distinctions within different textual forms of voice and focalization. The basic argument is that there are often similar but also opposing tendencies involving both narrative situations and focalization which include voice/perception, narration/mimesis, heterodiegetic/homodiegetic, mental/extra-mental, overt/covert, (Chatman 1978), reliable/unreliable (Booth 1961; Nünning/Nünning 2004: 120-21), narrator/reflector, telling/showing, first person reflector/third person reflector etc., and eventually requires a criterion for differentiation. As for strategies for making distinctions within the different narrative situations, attention shall be paid to the level of text on which the narrator, character, focalizer or subject whose identity

\(^{38}\) See McHale (1981) and also Palmer (2002) for this emphasis.
is responsible for inferred meaning is located in the poem. Other criteria for distinction shall include the degree of covertness/overtness, pronominal markers, distancing devices such as tense categories, telling devices, (un)reliability signals, reflector, and perceptual indicators.

Considering that narrating instances differ from one narrative situation to another as do their manner of constructing stories, part two of the project’s theoretical framework focuses on typologies for describing certain categories of narrators and their textual strategies of analysis. The categories of narrators concerned include the authorial (heterodiegetic) narrator, first-person (homodiegetic/autodiegetic) narrator, and the figural or reflector mode. In accordance with the specific needs of the study, the foregrounded textual indicators suitable for describing authorial narration, the first person-forms and the figural narrative mood are addressed separately. Textual markers proposed for the analysis of authorial (heterodiegetic) narrator include linguistic (overt and covert) indicators, metanarrative styles, (un)reliability signals (parallepsis and parallipsis), levels of perspective, pragmatic features pertaining to reader-address strategies (apostrophe, addressee), commentary, thematizing forms, generalizing and moralizing signals indicating someone with external voice, evocative imagery denoting external tone, tense categories that may determine which of the narrative situations one is dealing with, metaphorical emphasis indicating subject identity, psychonarration, and other markers pointing toward external level.

A discussion of strategies suitable for constructing and analyzing the authorial heterodiegetic narrator leads to another central part which centers on strategies for interpreting and analyzing first-person homodiegetic narrators. These include linguistic markers in the first-person ‘I’ and ‘we’, (un)reliability signals (parallepsis and parallipsis), character perspective, tense categories that may mark a narrative situation in the first-person such as simultaneous narration, retrospective form, action indicators, consciousness representation devices, markers for narrating self and experiencing self (common in autodiegetic narration) and more.

Another part of the theory chapter will attempt to answer the question of forms and functions of narration in Byron’s poetry by focusing on strategies of constructing or analyzing the figural reflector mode in both first and third-person texts such as narrated monologue, stream of consciousness, psychoanalogies, interior monologue, and other techniques for the representation of mental states and processes.

A further relevant phase of this chapter will propose strategies of distinctions and reference in discussing focalization. Typologies such as fixed focalization, internal
focalization, embedded focalization, complex or the ambiguous type will be helpful in constructing meaning in Byron’s narrative verse. The strategies that may encourage an interpretation of a text as focalized by an external agent, reflector character, homodiegetic narrator or experiencing self of homodiegetic narration include imagery (psychoanalogy), linguistic frames of thinking, remembering, feeling, hearing, viewing and dreaming, predictive modal markers or verbs and adjectives of speculative cognition, tense forms, proper nouns and pronominal references in the third-person singular, subject matter, deictics, perspective indicators, space markers, shift techniques, free indirect discourse, mind style used to relate the thoughts and feelings of a character (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 123) and other evocative descriptions that may be assigned to subjects performing the perceptual activity. The intention is to guide the reader’s understanding of the specific character of Byron’s narrative style, and eventually to engage them in the work as discriminative and analytical categories. By paying attention to the categories of focalization and their textual strategies, an attempt is made to offer a more synthesized approach to transgeneric narratology aiming at making it more productive for discussions of the verse narrative.

Since the project as a whole is conceived in terms of both theoretical and analytical emphasis, a remark on how the above categories and their strategies will be put to use in analyzing the corpus under study is important. The analysis is conceived in terms of two chapters. Chapter III, “An Analysis of the Uses of Certain Categories of Narrators in Byron’s Narrative Verse”, (separated into three major sections) intends to demonstrate how productive it can be to apply the categories of authorial (heterodiegetic) narrator, the first-person (homodiegetic form), narrating objects, communal voice, figural narrative mood and their approximate interpretive strategies to an analysis of Byron’s narrative verse and other longer poems aiming to show the ways Byron’s poetry can produce both text and context meanings by narrative means. To meet such a goal the textual strategies outlined above shall be of help in determining the ways the different narrator types enter the poetic texts as well as lead to an understanding of the roles they perform in the construction of meaning. Such strategies are also intended to guide an understanding of the ways in which narrating objects and subjects can be made to perform roles within and outside the limits of their generic contexts.

In an attempt to demonstrate the fruitfulness of applying narrative concept of focalization to the analysis of Byron’s poetry, chapter IV is entitled “How Focalization is used in Byron’s Poetry”. To show that focalization can be productive in poetry analysis, I shall focus on poems that provide narrative features of viewing, experiencing, dreaming, and
imagining (including imagery) that are useful for the determination of the source of perception. The strategies will help the study to determine whether focalization is external or internal. I shall also focus on categories of focalization such as compound, fixed, and complex. Putting said textual markers to use as analytical strategies with which to discuss focalization in Byron’s poetry, the chapter will analyze typical functions fulfilled focalization in Byron’s poetry. The trajectory of my argument is that those forms by which focalization enters the poetic texts perform formal, thematic and descriptive functions, and also constitute ways of updating transgeneric narratology. The chapter aims at using forms subsumed under the umbrella of focalization as a systematic framework for discussing questions of texts and contexts and to suggest ways in which narrative devices can be useful in the construction of meaning in poetry.

The analytical chapters as a whole constitute an attempt to articulate productive insights into discussions of poetry raised by narrative theory in order to deepen the readers understanding and appreciation of Byron’s poetry. The most important question of to what extent such a study, by virtue of its range of narrative devices, can contribute to transgeneric narratological discussions in poetry is the main goal the analysis. By proposing to put the categories outlined above to use in the analysis of Byron’s poetry, I intend to achieve the central goal of demonstrating the forms and functions of narration and focalization for constructing meaning in the said poetry.
II. TOWARDS AN INTEGRATIVE THEORY OF A TRANSGENERIC NARRATOLOGICAL APPROACH TO POETRY: NARRATORIAL VOICE, CONSCIOUSNESS REPRESENTATION CATEGORIES, PERSPECTIVE STRUCTURE AND FOCALIZATION AS CATEGORIES OF A TRANSGENERIC NARRATIVE THEORY OF POETRY

Post-Classical narratology is marked by a profusion of new methodologies and research hypothesis; the result is a host of new perspectives on the forms and functions of narrative itself. Such recent research has highlighted aspects of narrative discourse that classical narratology either failed or chose not to explore.

Palmer (2002: 28)

This study proposes certain forms of narratorial voice (authorial narration, first-person narration, figural or reflector mode, communal voice), perspective structure, tense aspects, techniques for the representation of consciousness and mental processes, metannarrative elements, techniques that may encourage a reading of a text as focalization and non-human objects that can be endowed with character traits or diegetic identity (because they engage in plot-oriented action and provide narrative functions) to constitute categories of a transgeneric narratological theory of poetry. As a secondary goal of my thesis, these fundamental narrative representations can serve as markers for speaking about the intersections of cultural narratology or history. In other words, narratorial voice, formal strategies and focalization constitute the areas where narrative devices enter the poetic text, and since they are the very narrative structures provided by cultural narratology (also subsumed under post classical

39 Adopting (Cf.) Ansgar Nünning’s (2001) theoretically informed reflections, I am not, however, going to explore the broader field of literary history, which is concerned with the writing of literary history, although my work touches slightly on issues of ideological concerns such as postcolonial subjects and literary cultures. Still adopting the above narratologist, I am also not concerned with defining culture or literary history, Marxism or even national identity often linked to such notions as culture. Rather, I use literary history to imply Byron’s individual contribution to literary history of narrative considering the features of narrative tradition he experimented with. Since cultural narratology recognizes that ‘ideology is located in narrative structures themselves, an analysis of the semantization of narrative forms can shed light on unspoken assumptions, attitudes, and ideologies, as well as values and norms prevalent in any given text, genre and period [...]’ (Ansgar Nünning 2004b: 369). Adopting Ansgar Nünning’s (2004b: 369) opinion that ‘narrative forms are socially constructed’ and that ‘narrative forms provide information about ideological concepts and world views’, I will rely on certain linguistic forms of narratorial voice and focalization to speak about ways by which ideology is located in poetic texts. I am also considering the changing forms assumed by narrative techniques in Byron’s narrative poetry and the functions that can be assigned to each technique as part of Byron’s contribution to the construction of narrative tradition and consequently literary history of narrative.
narratologies\textsuperscript{40}) for locating post colonial ideology of subject and subjection, values of communities, the Romantic literary values, genre, period or contexts in a narrative text, they will be analysed in this study as points of intersection between transgeneric narratology and culture. By concurrently taking into consideration both formal (linguistic) and extra-representational features (Lanser 1992) of speaking about textual agents, focalization and contexts provided by narrative theory and cultural narratology\textsuperscript{41}, the present study allows for a modification of transgeneric narratology beyond the scope of narrative devices provided by Hühn. In doing so, the study proposes linguistic elements for updating current developments in transgeneric narratological research and may also shed light on the link between narrative theory and cultural history\textsuperscript{42}. I therefore choose the quotation at the beginning of this chapter because, in its call for a narratology that resists boundary delineation, (associated with classical narratological orientation), the excerpt allows the study to discuss narrative means by which Byron’s poetry recreates both narrative and contexts. In the manner of Fludernik’s (2000: 343) and Ansgar Nünning’s (2000: 345) concern for an interdisciplinary project\textsuperscript{43} that may invigorate narratology with ‘numerous insights’ from parallel research areas aiming at a ‘major innovational expansion and reorientation’ one of the most difficult tasks that awaits criticism in transgeneric narratology is that of identifying those fundamental narrative

\textsuperscript{40} Hühn’s transgeneric (poetic) approach to mediation which is grounded on formal categories of narrators and focalizers found in lyric poetry appears to draw on the restricted insights of Genette’s (1980) mode, voice and focalization. Such an analysis of narrative features of mediation conceals many issues including those of contexts that are quite relevant to my study of how narration and focalization create ideologies and cultural contexts in Byron’s poetry. First, and to counter Chatman’s (1981) insistence that the narrator inhabits the world of discourse while the characters are found in the story world, there is a possibility that heterodiegetic narrators can be focalizers. Secondly, the formalist and structuralist features of narrative provided by Hühn’s transgeneric narrative theory are deficient in accounting for the ways issues of contexts enter Byron’s poetry- an issue I shall return to in my discussion of what narratology can do for the analysis of narratorial voice and perspective which cultural narratology can.

\textsuperscript{41} Ansgar Nünning’s (2000) cultural narratology (understood as an alliance between narratology and cultural history) proposes that formal techniques should be analysed not just as structural features of a narrative text, but as narrative modes which are highly semanticized and engaged in the process of cultural construction. I share this view and interpret cultural construction to mean ways by which narrative elements link narrative to cultural history on the level of ideology and individual texts.

\textsuperscript{42} It is true that transgeneric narratology and cultural history may have divergent theoretical and methodological objectives and demand different types of responses from readers or their users. But it would not also be true to say that they are categorically incompatible fields of criticism. The intersections between these critical disciplines are uncontroversial particularly regarding contexts, narration, focalization, voice-specific and perspective strategies that narratology studies in story telling features. Granted that Byron’s narrative verse itself (in the manner of its counterpart narrative fiction/prose) fulfils its purposes of telling stories by means of these same tools, there is therefore an extent to which the above approaches to mediation can be put to its analytical service. In other words the heterogeneous status of the corpus under study explains the thesis’s attempt to evolve an innovative approach to the study of narrative voice and focalization that subsumes concepts from other fields of inquiry like cultural history.

\textsuperscript{43} See Ansgar Nünning’s (2000: 367) analytical toolbox which is grounded on structuralist narratology and the new post-classical narratologies.
elements that allow this study to propose travelling concepts\(^4^4\) that may be useful to account for the forms and functions of narration and focalization in the analysis of Byron’s poetry. In other words, granted that both narratology and cultural history share similar suppositions in their assumptions that linguistic or formal devices may account for textual constructions of narrative and contexts, there is every reason to share Ansgar Nünning’s (2000: 367) opinion about ‘both the need to move beyond a merely descriptive poetics of narrative’ and to benefit from further mediational tools that the ‘crossing of disciplinary boundaries offers’.

Although my main concern is with exploring aspects of narrative provided by Byron’s poetry that can be accounted for in narrative terms, many of the narratological strategies that will be discussed as representations of narration and focalization (that cultural narratology also provides) will be considered as theoretical expansion of transgeneric narratology. This is already an indication that the call for an interdisciplinary approach to narrative theory has not passed unnoticed by this project; hence my interest in answering the crucial question of if and how Byron’s poetry recreates narrative and contexts. In my attempt to develop transgeneric narratology beyond previous emphasis on linguistic devices, this study adopts an approach that takes into consideration neither structural features of a narrative text nor an exclusive concern with context issues. It is rather one that is characterized by a simultaneous tenacity for both formal and context-specific ways of speaking about narration and focalization in poetry. Such an approach can therefore enable the study to introduce some innovative narrative insights into transgeneric theory of poetry criticism. Such an approach may pave the way for new reconceptualizations of the relationship between poetic texts and cultural history and the epistemological, historical, and cultural implications of narrative strategies.\(^4^5\)

As the emphasis and narratological scope of the above introductory argument implies, the central concern of the thesis is certainly not to create the impression of developing an

\(^{4^4}\) The term ‘travelling concept’ is used here to refer to both linguistic aspects and consciousness representation strategies that could account for ways issues of contexts and of narration and focalization enter Byron’s poetry. This means that their methodological and analytical relevance cut across disciplinary discriminatory tendencies that are so characteristic of classical narratology. I would also like to point out that such concepts may offer a broader and dynamic scope and even new productive ways of dealing with mediation beyond the scope of narrative strategies provided by Hühn.

\(^{4^5}\) Cf. Ansgar Nünning (2000: 345). The culture specific implications of narrative are not emphasized in Byron’s poetry. Nonetheless, the linguistic elements evident in the said poetry that may usefully answer questions relating to issues of post colonialism and contexts are not irrelevant. The culture specific forms of voice and focalization that we will see latter on can also account for the development of narrative techniques (unreliable narration for instance) within individual works using Byron’s poetry as a test case.
unprecedented transgeneric narrative approach to poetry criticism. Possibilities of engaging with questions of mediation in general have been the concern of narratology in one way or another and in different degrees of emphasis. But since the linguistic and structural devices that have been proposed by transgeneric narratology for discussing narration and focalization in texts do not make up an integrated, comprehensive and synthesized theory of narrative mediation, I wish, therefore, to attempt a synthesis.

While attempting to develop transgeneric narratology further from a modification of insights and models from both classical and post-classical schools of thought dealing with issues of narratorial voice, focalization and contexts, some clarification is needed. This is in relation to the corpus under study. Byron’s narrative poetry constructs quite different kinds of narratives – narrative fiction, prose, the biographical forms, legal narratives, and narratives about myths, post colonial issues and rituals, - all studied in narrative poetry through story telling. Identifying such a variety is an indication that Byron’s narrative poetry constructs various narrative structures ranging from what Ansgar Nünning (2000) describes as ‘properties unique to narrative texts’ to those that are culture-specific. Considering that such a variety of narrative aspects may account for the link that Byron’s poetry share with narrative and contexts, it may be important to ask whether ‘a single approach uncontaminated’ (Ansgar Nünning 2000: 354) by concepts and insights of approaches drawn from classical and post-classical narratology may be sufficient to come to terms with the study’s theoretical and analytical needs. Adopting theoretical reflections that narrative structures and formal devices are apt to reproduce contexts (a point to which we will return), the argument that ‘interdisciplinary alliances’ may look like ‘theoretical bastards whose hybrid nature even rigorous methodological nurture will never stick’ (Ansgar Nünning 2000: 353) may be challenged.

In an attempt to make obvious my own contribution in research on transgeneric narratology aiming to fill the gaps noticed, section 1.1 critically examines the approaches to voice and focalization drawn from poetry criticism. This will eventually lead me to indicate

46 For more on the different kinds of narratives and possible interdisciplinary projects developed to address their needs see Ansgar Nünning (2000: 353).

47 Adopting Ansgar Nünning’s (2000: 358) view that structuralist narratology is synchronous in orientation, places emphasis on narrative techniques, grammar of narratives, poetics of fiction, issues that are ahistorical, and focuses on structural features of narratives uncontaminated by notions of cultural or historical influences, political, ideological, and one may add, the context specific, I argue that forms of narration and focalization provided by structuralist narratology cannot offer satisfactory answers when it comes to questions that involve post colonialism, Romanticism, narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry.
new directions for research in poetry criticism that requires attention. Part of the responsibility of this section would constitute an attempt to explore the categories provided for the analysis of narratological voice and focalization while pointing to the limits within classical narratology and poetic approaches dealing with such questions. Since the project is aimed at developing Hühn’s (2004) transgeneric narratology further aiming to include linguistic and formal devices (that may represent ideology and issues of contexts) into narratological discussions of narration and focalization in poetry, section 1.2 of the theory chapter will attempt to propose an innovative transgeneric narratological modification of narrators and focalizers. The integration process will take the form of synthesizing conclusions from discourses on mediation by drawing on the insights of narrative approaches provided by Stanzel (1971), Cohn (1978), Chatman (1978, 1990b), Lanser (1992), Ansgar Nünning (2000, 2001, 2004a, 2004b), Helms (2003) and others, aiming to bring together both formal (structural) and context-specific forms of narratorial voice and focalization that can link Byron’s poetry to cultural contexts and narrative. Further, I shall suggest strategies that evolve from the intersections of approaches to mediation.

Since the reader meets narrators and focalizers in different narrative situations, on different levels, in different diegetic identities, performing different roles, part 2.2 will take a step away from analyzing restrictions to examining strategies by which the agents concerned in any given narrative communication act can be identified and distinguished from each other. Criteria such as narrative level (extradiegetic, homodiegetic), degree of participation (covert/overt), distancing strategies (telling, showing, temporal distance, special, tense form), setting (mental or extra-mental/external), perspective/voice, and (un)reliability to name a few, shall constitute methodological tools for coming to terms with questions of distinction in transgeneric narrative theory of poetry. These and more can offer an opportunity to bring together narrative strategies for constructing narrative meaning in poetry.

Since the study is an attempt to develop a new conceptualization of transgeneric narrative theory of poetry (through a synthesis of approaches), aiming to apply narrative categories to the analysis of Byron’s poetry, sections 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 propose textual markers that can effectively illustrate the integration of transgeneric narratology and cultural narratology, and by extension serve analytical functions. Section 2.3 entitled ‘Strategies of Interpretation and Analysis in Authorial Narrative Situation’ proposes narrative strategies that may encourage a reading of a text as authorial narration. Section 2.4 proposes strategies of reading that may encourage an interpretation of a text as a first-person homodiegetic
narration. Section 2.5 proposes consciousness representation strategies (that can transform textual sentences into subjects and endow them with meanings) for constructing the reflector mode in the poetry under study. The chapter will draw on indirect discourse (quoted monologue), stream of consciousness, speech categories, interior monologue, imagistic patterns (psycho-analogies) psychological vocabulary, free indirect discourse, psychonarration, and other mental and extra-mental representations of the mind including action, emotions, feelings and perceptual indicators. The last part of the theory chapter shall constitute an attempt to provide clues to focalization. By drawing on insights of transgeneric narratology, cultural narratology and other post-classical contributions dealing with narration and focalization, I shall attempt to make a modest contribution to transgeneric narratological approach to poetry criticism. Putting such an approach at the service of Byron’s poetry will allow the study to demonstrate the restrictions within previous criticism on Byron’s poetry.
1. Beyond Transgeneric Narratology

My transgeneric approach to the study of narration and focalization has been inspired by both Hühn’s transgeneric narratology and the more recent narratological interest interdisciplinary narratology. Nonetheless, in ways slightly different from transgeneric narratology, whose orientation is strictly formalist, the present approach takes into consideration structuralist features of narrative mediation and to an extent the context specific forms of speaking about subjects of narrative representations. Consequently, the project needs to integrate a number of approaches to narrative mediation. Transgeneric narratology developed by Hühn (2004) ignores certain forms of voice, subjects, certain narrative ways of representing consciousness and certain strategies of analyzing focalization. The approach does not provide narrative concepts for reproducing specific sociohistorical contexts and prioritizes certain formal and ‘textual features allegedly shared by all narratives’ (Allrath 2005: 16) that classical narrative theories of mediation has explored. My transgeneric narratological theory of poetry criticism operates on the hypothesis that narrative forms of mediation are neither exclusively those that answer questions related to structural features of a narrative text, nor ‘a-historical’ (Allrath 2005: 16) and universal (Nünning 2000: 358), but rather constitute narrative representations for speaking about narrative and cultures. My approach is thus not a purely new field of research, but one that results from a modification of previous narrative approaches to mediation. The issues the study aims to investigate make it mandatory to revisit the poetic, classical and post-classical theories focusing on narration and focalization mediation in order to render their limits and thus provide reasons to include certain neglected categories of narration and focalization in transgeneric theory of poetry.

1.1 Narrative Mediation and Transgeneric Narratology: From the Narratologically Oriented Analysis of Poetic Texts to an Integrated Theory of Transgeneric Narratological Reconceptualization of Narrators and Focalizers: An Overview and Critique of Approaches.

The approach to the study of mediation called ‘transgeneric narratology’ in poetry was introduced into poetry criticism by Hühn (2004) in his article “Transgeneric Narratology: Application to Lyric Poetry”. Nonetheless, the approach is not, of course, without

48 See also joint articles with Schönert (2004) on the question of mediation in poetry criticism.
narratological precedents and has to be seen in relation to earlier works.\footnote{Cf. Allrath (2005: 16) explaining similar narratological concerns in a different context.} Pointing out that the lyric and other types of poetry including verse stories share fundamental features with narrative (prose) fiction such as sequentiality, mediacy and articulation, Hühn (2002; 2004; 2005), and Hühn and Schönert (2005) criticize traditional narrative theory and some recent narrative approaches for not paying attention to poetry. Among narrative theorists who have contributed earlier analyses of narratology in poetry criticism are Kroeker (1966 [1960]; 1969), Kirchner (1973), Hühn and Schönert mentioned above, and Abad-Garcia (2005). Even though I consider these critics as having made early narrative contributions to poetry criticism, the point needs to be made that they have narrowly focused on the analysis of certain formal or structural features of narrative, ignoring other ways of representing issues of contexts, ideology and cultural subjects by narrative means, and of analysing focalization.\footnote{Even though Hühn (2004) has contributed earlier analysis of focalization in poetry, his transgeneric narratology of poetry reveals his exclusive concern with internal focalization inferred by the technique of simultaneous narration, a strategy he uses to justify what he calls coincidence of voice and focalization in autodiegetic narration.} True or false, as we shall see, Hühn’s narratological terminology of mediacy developed to make narratology provide conceptual and analytical functions in the lyric discourse does not take into consideration the fact that narrative poetry has variegated levels of narrative communication and thus requires narratology far beyond classical orientation which he drew from. This implies that my starting point for developing a more integrative theory of poetry is necessarily an examination of what has been done as a way of identifying areas of emphasis that still need further investigation.

Any attempt to expand the scope of poetry criticism to include structural and context forms of mediation inevitably starts with the findings of genre theory\footnote{I am not going to analyse generic features of Byron’s poetry. Rather, I am only concerned with the generic approaches to poetry which single out for investigation generic features of poetry that are narrative.} and other postmodern poetic approaches which may be linked to narratology by virtue of their concern with features that are linked to narrative communication like voice, utterance, subjectivity, and the depiction of speech agents.\footnote{Some generic, structuralist, and postmodern theories of poetry criticism come slightly closer to narratological issues. See a collection of articles in poetry criticism edited by Müller-Zettelmann and Rubik (2005); Hosek and Parker (1985); or even the 1978 edition by Joseph Patrick Strelka which is generic-oriented. These articles draw on the insights of modern literary and cultural theories (mostly the semantic, psychic, generic and narrative culture) as in the 2005 collection; and also on the insights of the post-structuralists theories of genre as with the 1985 collection. Although such restricted concerns show that much is still left undone in poetry criticism, the approaches are relevant as some of their conclusions regarding questions of utterance,} All these characteristic features have a relationship to mediation

49  Cf. Allrath (2005: 16) explaining similar narratological concerns in a different context.
50  Even though Hühn (2004) has contributed earlier analysis of focalization in poetry, his transgeneric narratology of poetry reveals his exclusive concern with internal focalization inferred by the technique of simultaneous narration, a strategy he uses to justify what he calls coincidence of voice and focalization in autodiegetic narration.
51  I am not going to analyse generic features of Byron’s poetry. Rather, I am only concerned with the generic approaches to poetry which single out for investigation generic features of poetry that are narrative.
52  Some generic, structuralist, and postmodern theories of poetry criticism come slightly closer to narratological issues. See a collection of articles in poetry criticism edited by Müller-Zettelmann and Rubik (2005); Hosek and Parker (1985); or even the 1978 edition by Joseph Patrick Strelka which is generic-oriented. These articles draw on the insights of modern literary and cultural theories (mostly the semantic, psychic, generic and narrative culture) as in the 2005 collection; and also on the insights of the post-structuralists theories of genre as with the 1985 collection. Although such restricted concerns show that much is still left undone in poetry criticism, the approaches are relevant as some of their conclusions regarding questions of utterance,
in the sense that they can be given diegetic identities or be made to represent textual subjects. Essays and approaches from critics like Werner Wolf (2005), Paul de Man (1986), Frye in the 1985 edition of Hosek and Parker (eds.), and Abad-Garcia (2005) have, in different ways, contributed existing analysis of the speaking voice, often emphasizing on forms by which the lyrical persona enters the poetic text. Although genre theory of the lyric has apparently been engaged in singling out particular aspects of the genre - namely the formal, thematic traits as well as structural and prosodic emphasis53 - the issues of character representation, subjectivity and speaking voice54 often come up. Paul de Man, quoted in the (1985: 55) edition of Hosek and Parker (eds), evokes the issue of communication in poetry criticism when he calls attention to the speaking voice of a text. In narrative theory, voice is linked to ‘telling’55 and can answer questions relating to narration. Frye also joins the critical debate on voice as signifying the identity of the speaker in a poetic text. M. H. Abrams (In: Hosek/Parker, eds. 1985: 99) in the same edition adds another dimension of voice, the psychological one, when, in his definition of the lyric he stresses the presence of a single speaker who expresses a state of mind or a process of thought and feeling. Although Abrams fails to provide strategies for representing this region called the mind, his reference to the psychological aspect is useful because the term evokes the concern with the role of internal processes in communication. Nonetheless, the emphasis on voice provided by genre theory and New Criticism does not sufficiently solve the central question regarding narrative mediation from the point of view of this study. In the first place, the narrative categories for distinctions as well as analytical strategies are missing from the above concepts of voice and speaker, which can be understood by the fact that in their methodology, genre theorists mentioned above have foregrounded the lyric with its limited speakers.

The same can be said of subjectivity often emphasized in genre theory of poetry. In his cognitive and prototypical communicative approach to poetry criticism, Werner Wolf (2005) recognizes the general tendency of often privileging ‘unmediated subjectivity’ as the essential

subjectivity and narrative forms are still central areas that can be systematized for the purpose of constructing textual subjects of meaning in poetry.

53 See Werner Wolf (2005) and Nortrop Frye (1985) for their exclusive emphasis on rhythm, and meter, which show the centrality of structural devices in early criticism on poetry.

54 Patricia Parker (1985: 16).

55 The narratological discussion of ‘telling’ is often understood to mean ‘mediation’, or the act of telling a story by someone, for example, the narrator, as opposed to a story that is unmediated, but interpreted from the perspective of some agent whose thoughts are central to narration. Chatman (1978: 33-34) makes a distinction between ‘telling’ understood to mean mediated and or involving a narrator, and ‘nonnarrated narrative’ understood in his words as ‘one that avoids the appearance of being told’.
quality of the lyric. Challenging earlier attempts to classify poetry as a distinctive genre for failing to produce satisfactory results, Wolf introduces a postmodern approach to poetry which takes into consideration a cognitive approach that addresses issues of communicative and functional aspects of the lyric. He goes back to generic descriptions. One of such areas of emphasis is the communicative one. First, he argues that the lyric has a communicative function because it also constructs the sender and the recipient. Secondly, he argues that the lyric communicates experience, emotion, reflections, mental states and consciousness. Certain aspects of postmodern poetic theory are relevant here. Werner Wolf (2005) identifies subjectivity and mental states as forms by which the lyric speaker enters the poetic text. The issues Werner Wolf raises regarding the lyric’s concern with experience, emotion and reflections suggest that a connection can be established between genre theory of poetry and narratology given that the above devices constitute mental processes of representing the lyric speaker. It is significant to note that, although the aspects of voice and subjectivity provided by genre theory are important, they are vaguely systematized.

In various degrees, a few studies have started suggesting the inclusion of narratological categories of representing mediation in poetry criticism to help in the analysis of poems. The article by Abad-Garcia (2005) provides certain linguistic and generic markers for narrative descriptions of poetry which are all connected to the central issue of narration raised by this study. In “Generic Descriptions and Postmodern Lyric Discourse”, Abad-Garcia implicitly highlights the relations between genre theory and narratology. To be more specific, he singles out poems that are both narrative and hybrids. To make the link between the lyric and narrative obvious, Abad-Garcia identifies narrative markers found in lyrics, especially in third-person texts (he, it, they) and in the first person forms (I, we), as well as the narrator. For Abad-Garcia, the usefulness of introducing narrative forms into poetry criticism - namely the speaking subject, the real historical or pragmatic agency, the communicative situation, and utterance evoking a stream of consciousness (272) - may be helpful in differentiating the generic forms of narrative representations from those that are typically lyric and dramatic. Even though Garcia’s self revealing or individuating strategies are unsystematized, they call to mind differentiations long postulated within classical narratology. The reader equally notices that, although Abad-Garcia’s main goal has not been to provide categories for describing narratorial voice, these strategies, however, foreground this and thereby anchor ways of establishing a link between genre theory and narratology. In suggesting the introduction of generic aspects of narrative into theoretical interpretation and analysis of poetry, such a study has laid the groundwork for linking poetry to narrative.
In his article “Transgeneric Narratology”, Hühn (2004: 140) shifts the focus away from generic inquiries that tend to deal mainly with the exploration of subjectivity, person forms, utterance and the lyric persona as fundamental features of narrative the lyric contains, and develops a theory of mediacy\textsuperscript{56} that subsumes categories of narrative voice and focalization which, though restricted, are relevant for this present transgeneric project. Regretting that traditional narratology and also the more recent narrative theory has tended to restrict their focus exclusively to the analysis of narrative (prose) fiction as the one genre essentially defined by the device of story telling, Hühn (2004: 139) develops transgeneric narratology aiming to come to terms with problems of mediation that may be raised in the lyric. Consequently, he introduces certain narrative strategies into poetry criticism that allow considerations of levels, mode and agents of mediation such as voice and focalization, arguing that they constitute fundamental constitutive aspects of mediacy\textsuperscript{57} of narrative communication. Hühn thereby brings into poetry criticism narratological terminology and narrative strategies which genre theory of poetry, engaging issues of narrative aspects that are generic, has so far failed to explore.

Hühn (2004: 140) justifies this intergeneric application of narratology to poetry by arguing that lyric poetry generally contains the same fundamental constituents as narrative fiction, mediating its sequence of incidents from a particular perspective, and indicating the act of utterance or articulation through which the sequence is mediated in the medium of a verbal text.\textsuperscript{58} Based on the constitutive elements of mediacy\textsuperscript{59} (voice and perspective) that

---

\textsuperscript{56} Agreeing with structuralists like Chatman (1978) and Genette’s (1980) analysis of ‘story and text’; Rimmon-Kenan’s (2002) ‘story and discourse’, and especially buying into conceptions of sequentiality and mediacy as constitutive parts of most narratives, Hühn evolves the poetic approach to mediacy. It is crucial to point out, as Hühn acknowledges, that his analysis of both dimensions of mediacy draws on Genette (1980), but nonetheless follows modifications from his narratological offsprings.

\textsuperscript{57} Mediacy, according to Hühn (2004: 139), and also this study, is understood to mean the presentation and interpretation of the sequence of events by agents of mediation from a particular perspective. Based on Cohn’s (1978) narrative modes for presenting consciousness in fictive texts, Genette’s (1980) concepts of narration and focalization, Stanzel’s (1971) narrative situations and categories of mediation, Chatman’s (1978: 19) understanding of story as ‘the content or chain of events (actions, happenings), as well as existents (characters, items of setting) and discourse which he defines as ‘the expression, the means by which the content is communicated’), I use the term mediacy to include all constitutive features of narrative that can account for a description and interpretation of agents and levels of narrative communication including voice, categories for representing consciousness, and forms of perspective and focalization.

\textsuperscript{58} To say lyric poetry possesses the three fundamental narratological categories of sequentiality, articulation, and most specifically mediation, which is central to this study, is not to blur the distinction between the lyric and narrative (prose) genres, as Hühn points out, but to use their common feature as a test case for bringing narratology into poetic discussions.

\textsuperscript{59} For specific forms of narrativity that are often used in poetry but not emphasized in narrative (prose), see Hühn (2004: 151-153) for examples such as narrating from a position inside the ongoing story, telling a story prospectively, simultaneous telling and enacting a story. It should be noticed that the lyric constructs its plot
are also the intersecting grounds of the two genres of poetry and narrative fiction, Hühn finds convincing grounds to argue that the ‘transgeneric approach may provide a fresh impetus to the deficient theory of poetry as well as suggest new interpretative methods for its practical analysis of poems’ (2004: 140). One of such areas of interrelationship which needs to be investigated for further development because it raises new questions that theories of poetry criticism have not taken into account is mediacy understood by Hühn as forms or entities that mediate happenings on the level of presentation. Hühn (2004) and Hühn and Schönert (2005) go further to propose transgeneric-narratological constitutive elements of mediation arguing that, as a starting point for the ‘complete description of the structure of narrative sequentiality’ (Hühn 2004: 147), consideration must be given to ‘the forms and entities that mediate the happenings on the level of presentation’ (Hühn and Schönert 2005: 8). Two fundamental dimensions of mediacy that Hühn proposes for a narrative analysis of poems include, on the one hand, agents and levels of mediation and types of perspective, on the other. Within the category of mediacy are also two major distinctions often applicable to narrative texts that use mediation, namely agents and focalization. The specification of the forms and entities that mediate the happenings on the communication level within a text is, according to these narratologists, based on two criteria: first, that of mode of mediation, and second, mediating entities. Hühn and Schönert also introduce a further relevant distinction between mode of mediation and mediating agents. Mode of mediation subsumes two levels of manifestations of mediacy, namely voice and perspective. According to Hühn and Schönert (2005: 8) the concept of voice is used to imply ‘direct linguistic expression whose deictic (pronominal, spatial, and modal) orientation is provided by the speaking subject’. Arguing that ‘focalization is the perceptual, psychological, cognitive, and ideological perspective from which incidents and existents are presented and through which they are interpreted and or evaluated […]’, Hühn and Schönert (2005: 8) succeeds to provide criteria for determining focalization in a poetic text.

---

60 In a joint article by Hühn and Schönert (2005), this line of thought is emphasized. These narratologists go beyond mere conceptualization of voice in reference terms by applying the categories of narrative agents and focalization to the analysis of certain individual lyrics aiming to reveal their crucial roles in the analysis of narrative communication in texts.
The concept of mediacy has a central role to play in transgeneric narrative theory of poetry. Hühn and Schönert suggest that forms and entities that mediate the happenings are useful for describing narrative transmission in poetry. In one of such groundbreaking narrative analyses specifically dealing with mediating agents, Hühn (2004: 147) proposes four categories of speech agents ‘who may be located on four different levels’ of any given text: the biographical author (producer of a text), the textual subject or composing subject or compositional organization of the text (understood not as figure, but as a construct or implied author), the speaker or narrator, and the protagonist or main figure who often features in the narrated incidents. Hühn further suggests that the category of (un)reliability may be useful in making distinctions within the different communicative levels within a text: the levels occupied by the textual subject and the personalized speaker. According to Hühn (2004: 148), the concept of (un)reliability is theoretically apt to allow ‘for a more differential analysis of the conditions and manifestations of subjectivity’ in poetry and, in addition, will allow the study to explore certain forms of first-person manifestations in any given poetic text. In introducing narrative categories of speech agents, (un)reliability and perspective into poetry criticism, Hühn intends to use narrative features of voice and focalization as a means of exploring both the similarities and differences between the lyric and narrative fiction. However relevant his categories are, one needs to point out that narrative poetry constructs further levels of narrative situations to which we shall return, including authorial narration in both first and third-person texts, the figural mode in the same dimensions, and the two types of ‘first-person’ narrating I-witness or I-protagonist, some falling outside the scope of Hühn’s model of mediation. Another relevant category within the dimension of mediacy that Hühn introduces into the analysis of mediation in poetry is called perspective, so far unconceivable in poetry criticism. According to Hühn, the distinction between voice and focalization, is that between the agent responsible for the language used in the text, the verbal
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61 For a detailed analysis of the relationship between first-person narration and unreliability, see Meindl (2004: 59-63). Meindl’s emphasis on unreliability as a crucial marking for first-person narration will be considered in due course.

62 For this distinction, see Genette (1980: 187).

63 See also Genette (1980) and Manfred Jahn (1996). Genette (1980: 185-186) locates narrative perspective as an aspect of mood and goes further to define perspective as ‘point of view’, which he conceptualizes as ‘who sees?’ Adopting Huhn’s (2004: 149) argument that perspective should not be seen as a synonym for ‘point of view’, but as a superordinate term covering the different basic modes of presenting objects, persons, situations etc., I will use the term here and elsewhere to exceed the limits of Genette’s definition. For more on the forms and functions that can be ascribed to perspective beyond Genette and Hühn’s conceptions, see Ansgar Nünning (2001: 207-224).
utterance (‘who speaks?’) on the one hand and the position that the perceptual as well as cognitive, psychological, and ideological forms on the incidents (‘who sees?’ or rather more generally, ‘who perceives’) on the other (Hühn 2004: 149).

Hühn (and Schönert, with whom he authors similar articles on the application of narratology to poetry) goes beyond introducing typologies. Following Structuralists, Hühn introduces more systematic distinctions into poetry discussion of voice and focalization. Hühn introduces a distinction between the experiencing self (the self that saw or experienced the events) and the narrating self (the self that recounts events imaginatively, or from memory) typical of autodiegetic narration. Grounding his argument on the conviction that voice and narrator can be distinct, he introduces the typology of retrospective homodiegetic narration to conceptualize narration in which a distance between the narrating and the experiencing self occurs, understood to mean a difference in temporal as well as cognitive and emotional considerations. In a further attempt to justify the application of narratology to poetry criticism, Hühn (2004: 149) argues that ‘Romantic Poetry but also modernist poems, [...] often suggest the congruence of speaker and protagonist (of narrator and character discourse), as well as the coincidence of voice and focalization through simultaneous narration’ by using the present tense and first-person pronouns, aiming to dramatize the act of articulation. Hühn proceeds to analyze a cross section of mostly romantic lyric poems that employ certain techniques of mediation such as forms of voice and perspective (specifically in first person narration). In yet another analysis of poems, he attempts to render obvious the relationship of the narrator and protagonist to the story in terms of tense modes. Based on his analysis, the telling of the experience itself and the time it occurs on the story level may make one way clear by which the speaker identifies him/herself through his/her narration. Notice that in Hühn’s category of

64 The term ‘voice’ (a controversial issue criticized for its vagueness and ambiguity) has been coined by Genette (1980: 186) in connection with the question of ‘who speaks’, or ‘who is the narrator?’ as opposed to ‘mode’ which he narrowly conceptualizes in the question ‘who is the character whose point of view orients the narrative report?’ Following Genette, narratologists have since then, as we shall see, used ‘voice’ usually in distinction from the narrative categories of perspective or point of view which correlate with ‘who sees’ (cf. Aczel 1998: 468). Even Hühn’s categories of voice like Genette’s indicate nothing about how a speaker speaks. The distinction between voice and perspective, especially the criterion for narrative voice in terms of the the question ‘who speaks?’ has also meant the further question ‘when’ which Genette, analyses into three distinct areas of time, level and person. Genette’s delimitation of voice into these three areas is relevant, yet not without restrictions. Notice that in certain fragments of Byron’s poems like “Lara”, “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” etc., the attribution of voice is ambiguous, to use Aczel’s phrase, especially in third person texts that construct free indirect discourse modes. It is necessary, then, to go beyond both Hühn and Genette’s categories of voice (time, level and person) to include context, which may necessitate the further criteria of degree of narrated events, free indirect discourse cases, extra-mental phenomenon, culture specific forms of voice, and forms which we shall come to later.

retrospective narration, the strategy available for the speaker to bring his/her past to life is what Hühn calls the plot of imagination. By proposing imagination as one form of defining or determining the speaker’s identity, Hühn (2005: 155-156) appears to suggest that imagination also contributes to the process of poetic creation and can become a strategy for self-identification in the analysis of narration in poetry. Although Hühn does not attempt to link the concept of imagination to focalization, we will do so in the analysis of Byron’s poems and argue that the act of imagination is a psychic event and a form of perception and can be helpful in determining the textual agent at the origin of perception and his level in the text. The concept of imagination will thus be used as a focalizing device. In other words, the term ‘imagination’ needs to be conceptualized into consciousness representation category to enable it acquire functions in the analysis of Byron’s poetry. Other strategies for constructing the speaker’s perspective, interiority, or personal narrative; or the narrator’s subjectivity and individuality, (identity) following Hühn’s analysis (2004: 152) include forms of self-attribution and mental events. In his analysis of poems with ‘multiple perspectivity’ (2004: 151) such as T. S. Eliots “The Waste Land” where voice and focalizers are fragmented, Shelley’s sonnet “Lift not the Painted Veil”, in which the heterodiegetic narrator is separated from the protagonist through internal focalization, and finally Grave’s “Beauty in Trouble” which employs self-irony as a means of putting apart voice and focalizer, or the Victorian dramatic monologue with the deliberate dissociation of narrator and text subject (cf. Hühn 2004: 151), Hühn theoretically associates narratological distinctions with poetry, and also foregrounds answers to question of how voice, focalization and contexts enter the poetic text and allow for a construction of meaning.

In addition, the phenomenon of self-narration (which has been widely discussed in narratology and literary criticism, specifically in what is called ‘life writing’, but not yet with respect to poetry) is relevant for the study’s discussion of narration. The concept of self-narration may allow for a more specific analysis of poems written in the first-person and in the present tense. Tense categories that are important for my discussion of narration

66 Notice, however, that Hühn does not attempt to conceptualize imagination under consciousness representation strategies and perceptual forms following narrative theorists of mediation including Cohn (1978), as this study has attempted to do. The reader’s attention needs to be drawn to the fact that Hühn applies the concept of imagination in a narrow sense to show one way a poet can create his identity in poetry.


68 Cf. Hühn (2004: 152). Byron’s poetry constructs such forms in poems like “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage”, especially at the beginning of the narrative, a poem that conflates narrative voice and subjectivity.

proposed by Hühn are simultaneous narration and retrospective narration. The use of the past and the present tenses will help the study to highlight specificities of the homodiegetic, or even autodiegetic first-person narration in the analysis of poems.

Relevant for the model of transgeneric narratology are some categories of voice proposed by Hühn to describe different plots in a communicative situation act. In an article entitled “Plotting the Lyric” (2005: 153), Hühn proposes analytical tools for narration such as the present tense and first-person pronouns. Depending on the reader’s knowledge of what mental features and level of self-awareness can be attributed to the narrator (the narrating I), and the abstract author, respectively (Hühn/Schönert 2005: 9), a distinction can be made between the abstract author and the speaker. The devices proposed by Hühn to describe both voice and focalization are particularly relevant for my model of transgeneric narratology because they may constitute markers for a narrative situation, and may also create the impression of immediacy, spontaneity and authenticity in the analysis of first person texts.

The transgeneric narratological model of mediacy provides narrative categories to discuss narration and focalization in the lyric ranging from self-narration, tense forms, unreliability, speech agents, simultaneous narration and retrospective narration, and hence introduces new narrative concepts and differentiations in mediacy hardly available specifically within poetry criticism. Of importance are the categories of simultaneous narration, retrospective and prospective narration, which are also relevant parameters for analyzing the role of tense in determining voice in a narrative communication act. The analytical categories of voice, perspective, and tense forms can be employed for making systematic distinctions, descriptions and analyses of the levels and forms of mediation than are normally distinguished within lyric texts, to borrow Hühn’s (2005: 153) emphasis. It is clear from the discussion above that Hühn and Schönert have introduced narrative categories of voice and focalization into theoretical distinctions and analyses of poems mostly written in the first-person. Hühn’s concepts of self narration, tense, subjectivity, simultaneous and retrospective narrations and focalization constitutive methodological foundations of the
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70 Hühn (2004: 146) believes that plot in poetry constitutes of mental phenomena that come into poetry through mediums such as ‘ideas, memories, desires, emotions, imagination and attitudes which the agent in a monological, reflective and cognitive process apply to himself as his plot through which he can then define or stabilize his self-concept or identity’.

71 The distinction may sometimes be difficult as in the case of consonant self-narration (Cohn 1978) in which there is no distance between the narrating and the experiencing (perceiving or reflecting) self.

72 See Genette (1980: 29) who relevantly argues that with the category of ‘tense’, the relationship between the time of the story and the time of the discourse is expressed.
concept of mediacy of narrative communication, and are apt to provoke fruitful ways of analyzing mediation in poetry. Like his Structuralist predecessors, Hühn’s introduction of mediacy for the analysis of communication in the lyric allows one to depart from generic descriptions that are restricted in many ways (as discussed earlier) including the tendency to describe mental phenomena in terms of subjectivity only. Drawing on Hühn’s model of mediacy, the study will deploy his categories to analyse narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry.

Despite the relevance of Hühn’s transgeneric narratological model of mediacy for this study, the terminology of transgeneric narratology is not as yet a synthesized approach and leaves unanswered certain fundamental questions that cannot be separated from the analysis of narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry. These are questions relating to ideology, contexts, and mediation. The relevant but omitted categories include authorial narrative situation, perspective structure, metannarative strategies, the figural mode, communal voice and collective voice. The other unemphasized categories of narration are the total absence of narrative categories for representing consciousness - some of which include, psychonarration, interior monologue, psychoanalogy - in both first- and third-person texts that theorists of consciousness, including Dorrit Cohn (1978) and to an extent Stanzel (1971), Fludernik (1996), Chatman und van Peer (2001) and Palmer (2002) have conceptualized in varied ways including the figural mode (understood to mean the character acts from the story plane-musing, thinking, reflecting, dreaming, memorizing and creating the illusion of a reflector). The crucial question of how narrative creates contexts and ideologies which is attempted in this study by means of linguistic categories of voice and focalization cannot sufficiently be answered by relying on Hühn’s categories for analyzing agents and levels of perspective. It is noticeable that Hühn’s approach ignores narrative situations in which the narrator is homodiegetic but speaks for either him/herself or a collective in ways conceptualized by Lanser (1992) as personal voice, collective voice and the collective perspective. Another unemphasized area in Hühn’s transgeneric poetic model of mediation is the case where the narrator is in the third person (heterodiegetic) but often merges his voice with the thoughts of
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73 This is, however, neither to dismiss earlier generic approaches to lyric poetry or Hühn’s categories of describing lyric speakers and perspective analyzed above as irrelevant; nor to say that they have no place at all in the analysis of mediation in narrative poetry. My point is that Hühn (2004) says poetry has a link with narrative (prose) fiction, and yet has limited the range of speakers and focalizers for discussing poetry. Hence, other relevant categories of narration and focalization that can be analyzed on the discourse and diegetic levels of narrative poems have not been investigated. Consequently, narrative focus appears to be diverted from other types of context and linguistic categories of first-person and third-person narrators that feature within the sub-category of narrative verse which Byron constructed.
the reflector character in what is narratologically conceptualized as free indirect discourse (Cohn’s narrated monologue). The omission of the crucial category of authorial (heterodiegetic) narrator is worthy of note considering its relevance for the analysis of mediation in third person narrative poems like “Don Juan” and “Lara” among many others. One may as well note the absent consideration for the narratee\textsuperscript{74} in transgeneric narratology. There is a noticeable disregard for the category of perspective structure that play a crucial role in this study in the analysis of narrators, character-perspective and narrator-perspective, and in linking transgeneric narratology to cultural narratology. Transgeneric narratology ignores narrative situations in which the narrator is homodiegetic but speaks for either himself or a particular community of people in ways conceptualized by Lanser in \textit{Fictions of Authority} (1992) as communal and collective voices (which are culture-specific ways of linking voice to context and or ideology and will be useful in the study as a tool for reproducing post colonial issues of subject and subjectivity). Last but not least, the narrative categories of distinction, interpretation and analysis necessary for locating the focalizer and for constructing fixed focalization, internal focalization, collective focalization and compound focalization in poems written in the first- and third-person forms which narratologists beginning with Genette (1980), Bal (1985), O’Neill (1994) and others have elaborated upon, have not been considered.

Additionally, such metannarrative ways of analyzing narrative mediation as ‘you narratives’\textsuperscript{75} (and one may add ‘we’, ‘he/she’, ‘they’ forms in “Lara”, “Don Juan”, “Giaour” etc.) are not covered by the typology (Gaby Allrath’s 2005: 21 phrase in a different context). Consequently, the most crucial question of making transgeneric narratology an interdisciplinary transgeneric project by means of linking linguistic devices to specific socio-historical contexts is ignored in transgeneric narratology.

The above emphasis on limitations within transgeneric narratology is already an indication that this project seeks to integrate into transgeneric narratology both structural and formal devices that have the potential of constructing both issues of narrative and contexts by narrative means. This is why the study proposes to introduce new differentiations and

\textsuperscript{74} For a discussion on the narratee as ‘receiver’ located on the diegetic level of a narrative situation and thus plays a crucial role in mediation, see Genette (1980: 259). See Genette (1980: 259-262) for textual forms a narratee can assume including intradiegetic and extradiegetic narratees located on the intradiegetic and extradiegetic levels of a narrative respectively.

\textsuperscript{75} See also de Jong’s article in van Peer and Seymour Chatman (eds.) (2001).
analytical categories into transgeneric narratology as a point of departure from existing theories of poetry applying narratological models.

1.2 Synthesizing Approaches to Narrative Mediation: Voice, Perceptual Forms, Perspective Structure, Tense Forms, Metanarrative Elements and Techniques for the Representation of Mental Processes as Categories of a Transgeneric Narratological Conception of Narrators and Focalizers

The central objective of this study is to bring together approaches to mediation and use their common features first as intersecting grounds between transgeneric narratology and cultural narratology, and further as markers that may aid in the analysis of narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry. The question underlying the interdisciplinary transgeneric bent of this thesis is that of how one can create both narrative and context including ideology by means of narrative structures provided by narrative theory and cultural narratology. A starting point for an exploration of intersecting grounds between transgeneric narratology and cultural narratology would be the consideration that narrative itself functions as a tool for constructing specific cultural contexts (including history/ideology of a given period) since it provides formal structures for reproducing specific cultures from which it emanates. The inclusion of the linguistic parameters, categories of voice, strategies for the representation of consciousness, metanarrative devices, narratee strategies, tense aspects, focalization and perspective structure within transgeneric narrative theory of mediation aiming for the exploration of the interlinks between narratology and cultural narratology may open up new avenues for relevant modifications within transgeneric narratology. A major theoretical limitation inherent in Hühn’s concept of mediacy (already indicated above) is its exclusive focus on structural forms of analysing agents of mediation and focalization on the story level in the lyric discourse and constitutes the reason for my attempt to develop transgeneric narratology into a more integrated approach. Based on Hühn’s typology and methodology, the role of transgeneric approach to poetry is reduced to the analysis of linguistic or structural features a text can construct. The limitations indicated above have thus come to mean restrictions in the scope and potential of transgeneric narratological poetic theory of mediacy. Based on these identified areas of concern as yet to be adequately focused on, it seems to me that an inclusion of certain linguistic and voice categories of analyzing mediation (drawn from
classical, post-classical and cultural narratology) within the transgeneric theory of mediation may feature an integrated and innovative approach for coming to terms with issues of narrative mediation and cultures in poetry criticism. The question to engage is how this marriage of apparently different methodologies can be conceptualized to make this integration a fruitful transgeneric attempt.  

In a bid to develop a systematic way of linking aspects of narration and focalization provided by Byron’s poetry to issues of ideology, contexts and values, and considering that the modifications within transgeneric narratology may be insufficient without the insights of narrative theory (classical and post classical), the methodology for my research is integrative, descriptive, interpretive and analytical, involving a synthesis of relevant concepts dealing with mediation from narratology and cultural narratology. By so doing, I will propose the various forms of narration and focalization that link these fields. We now turn briefly to the process of integration. The relationship of transgeneric narratology and cultural narratology is conceptualized in my study in two intersecting ways: First ideology is encapsulated in narrative structures with the results that narrative participates in providing ways of generating cultural meaning. Second, narrative provides linguistic devices for constructing the very sociohistorical contexts from which it emanates. In a way that is congruent to Ansgar Nünning’s (2004b: 369) theoretical reflections that ‘ideology is located in narrative structures themselves, and the further assumption that narrative is produced and reproduced from cultures and in turn contributes to the creation of the cultures from which it emanates, my central argument is that a productive area in the study of culture is narrative. My next presupposition is that formal features of narrative provided by narration and focalization are shared by all approaches to mediation. The very formal or linguistic features that are productive for constructing narrative are also relevant for reproducing issues of ideology, themes and contexts in Byron’s poetry. To make this relationship theoretically tangible, I am going to outline the ways formal features of Byron’s poetry incarnate and reproduce the very contexts and ideologies that are addressed in it. Guided by the assumption that ‘narrative forms are socially constructed’ (Ansgar Nünning, 2004b: 369), I argue that some of Byron’s
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76 It is important to draw the reader’s attention to the fact that even though theories of mediation drawn from both narrative theory and cultural history on which this study relies (especially those provided by Genette, Stanzel, Cohn, Chatman, Rimmon-Kenan, Nünning and Helmes including the cultural narratological category of perspective structure for the conceptualization of narrators and focalizers) differ slightly in their methodologies and functions, they nonetheless have similarities in their emphasis on narrative. In other words, my attempt to bring together approaches to mediation in a single integrated model for investigating the intersections of transgeneric narratology and cultural narratology presupposes that methodologies that constitute this alliance involve analogous parameters.
poems call into question ideologies, contexts, values of the narrative and Romantic literary traditions, legal issues, post-colonial issues of subjects, colonial power and subjectivity, and appear to give voice and perspective to textual subjects that represent both narrative and cultural contexts. In reading these narrative poems, it appears to me that issues of narrative itself, the Romantic literary tradition, crime and punishment and the post colonial issues of subjects, subjection, power, authority, imprisonment, oppression, and injustice are constituted and represented by narrative or linguistic means. This is the point where the integration between transgeneric narratology and cultural narratology can be established in this study, and the very ground on which I base one of my central goals of updating transgeneric narrative theory of poetry with features that are both formal and culture specific. Among the possible ways of integrating thematic contexts into narratology, I propose linguistic devices and narratorial voice as relevant parameters for linking narration in Byron’s poetry to law (though not considered in my analysis) and post colonial issues of colonial power, authority, subjects and subjectivity. I also propose the use of mental and perceptual strategies including narratorial voice to relate theories of focalization and narration to narrative, Romantic literary values, ethics, textual and contextual issues. From the above explanation, the study proposes voice, linguistic evidence, perspective structure, metannarative forms, consciousness representation categories and perceptual indicators subsumed under focalization as some of the prominent narrative devices that allow for conclusive statements about the functions of narrative in constructing contexts or specific sociohistorical cultures (as will be seen of my analysis of the ways post colonial issues, the Romantic and also the narrative cultures are constructed in Byron’s poetry via narrative means). The attempt to bring together theories with divergent methodologies does not only encourage the understanding that narrative is the point where the intersections of transgeneric narratology and cultural history can be established to produce a richer blend, but also suggests that the methodologies that constitute this alliance can perform similar roles. The narrative devices proposed above can be brought together into an integrated approach as evidence of intersections between narratology and cultural history, and as narrative categories that make it possible to represent ideologies and cultures in Byron’s texts. On such grounds, narrative techniques in question can be said to have a relationship with culture; they link form to content (Ansgar Nünning, 2000: 360) and will be used in my analysis as appropriate tools for representing the post colonial, the Romantic and context issues in Byron’s narrative poetry.

Narratological approaches and observations that directly or indirectly engage issues of the link between narratology and contexts exist. However, approaches that engage questions
of mediacy of narrative transmission and that tend to display classical and post-classical narratology’s interest in raising and answering questions dealing with narration and focalization need to be consulted in the process of integration. Genette (1980) has provided concepts such as voice in his strategies of homodiegetic and heterodiegetic narrators to account for mediation. Stanzel (1971) has proposed the categories of authorial narrative situation, the first-person and figural narrative situation or reflector, which Cohn conceptualizes under first- and third-person texts for the same purpose. Cohn (1978) has elaborated on consciousness representation strategies to analyze mediation in first- and third-person texts, to which we shall return. On her part, Fleischman (1990) has provided tense categories to analyze narration and focalization. Many narratologists including Bal (1985), Fludernik (1996), O’Neill (1994) and others we shall not ignore have provided categories and clues for the analysis of focalization. Ansgar Nünning’s (2000) approach to cultural history proposes unreliable narration and perspective structure (which subsumes narrators, characters, focalizers) to account for ways cultural history can be represented in any given narrative.

Relevant for my attempt at developing an integrative transgeneric approach to mediation is the category of communal voice. Lanser’s (1992: 4) understanding of narrative voice goes beyond ‘formal structures of particular narrative practices’. An engagement with both formal and context oriented representations of voice or textual subjects may lead to what Lanser (1992: 8) calls ‘a new narrative poetics’, understood as one that is not simply restricted to ‘a poetics attentive to issues that conventional narratology devalued or ignored’. This is an argument she justifies by introducing voice categories of collective and personal forms to represent silenced communities, which are very relevant considering their usefulness for the analysis of Byron’s post colonial oriented poems about colonized subjects, slaves and dehumanized communities (as in “The Prisoner of Chillon”). These preludial arguments clearly suggest that the narratological term ‘voice’ should designate both the formal categories and other forms which are culture-specific, otherwise an exclusive dependence on the purely formal implications of voice may leave context and ideological issues of Romanticism and post colonialism unaccounted for in narrative terms. Consequently, my concern with voice from a transgeneric narratological orientation is grounded on the argument that whether one focuses on issues of narrative, or contexts, (cultures, individual narrative style, genre in general), or to be more specific Romanticism and the post colonial, it is important to note that these thematic concerns enter the narrative through narrative representations. In the context of this study, it is the question of what kind of narrative and specific contexts or ideology is represented, ‘who does the representing, who is the object,
and who is the subject […]’ (Ansgar Nünning 2000: 361), and what formal devices are deployed. It is precisely the question of how law, Post colonial issues, certain Romantic ideologies and different narratives are represented in Byron’s poetry; and also that of whose voice and perspective is represented. Such questions as to who the subjects and objects of narrative representations are (cf. Nünning 2000), and the crucial one of how cultures and narrative are represented in Byron’s poetry can find answers in Lanser’s (1992), Ansgar Nünning’s (2000), classical and post-classical approaches whose categories of linguistic or formal structures, voice, consciousness representation forms and perspective structure may provide useful tools to link transgeneric narratology and cultural narratology. It is particularly certain formal narrative representations that connect transgeneric narratology to cultural narratology.

When Ansgar Nünning adopts and reinforces the argument that ‘narrative is ubiquitous’ in the contemporary world and, in fact, so commonplace that it would be difficult to think about ideological and cultural forms without encountering it, and, further, ‘that the idea of culture, either in general or in particular, is a narrative […]’ (2000: 359), he can be understood as evoking the crucial question of how cultures are represented in narratives. His opinion that narrative is encountered in cultures and vice versa is relevant for my transgeneric project considering that the post-colonial culture of dehumanization, identity, subject, subjection, imprisonment and Romantic tendencies enter Byron’s narrative verse through narrative structures and also narrating cultural subjects. They inevitably need to be included in the transgeneric model of mediation.

Similarly, the question of how cultural history can be represented in narrative has been attempted by Belsey: ‘We are subjects to the degree that we are able to take the position of the grammatical subject, author or agent of the verb […] the literary has, […] a history, and […] that history is precisely cultural’ (2001: 48, 51). Belsey’s statement above can be understood to mean that any specific cultural history of a people or ideology is represented by means of narrative. Based on textual evidence, any textual agent or object that features as participant in
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77 Ansgar Nünning was the first to suggest this kind of synthesis, which he justifies by reference to the category of perspective structure, although categories of communal voice, and collective consciousness are absent from his typology. The ubiquity of narratives makes it difficult to establish the boundaries between approaches that constitute the focus of this chapter, yet it is also possible to outline some of the methodological consequences that it entails (cf. Ansgar Nünning 2000: 359) as they incorporate structuralist approaches. This means that I do not ignore them completely.

78 Bal (1981a/b) also argues that textual objects (non-human) with a diegetic name can become narrating agents.
the ‘story-related action sentences’ (Jahn 2005: N3.1.5) will be considered a narrating agent representing a literary history, ideology or perhaps a specific culture. Belsey not only seems to ask the question of how one can represent literary history, but can be understood as saying that such a representation can only be possible by a reliance on textual or grammatical subjects and objects which this study conceptualizes under forms of narration and focalization. This is where concepts like homodiegetic, heterodiegetic, figural narration and communal voice come into transgeneric narratology. Similarly, Ansgar Nünning (2001: 55) quotes McHale in an insightful statement that also suggests the link between cultural history and transgeneric narratology:

[L]iterary-historical, objects […] are constructed, not given or found […] . [T]he issue of how such objects are constructed and in particular the genre or discourse in which they are constructed, becomes crucial […] .

Notice that the quotation above focuses on historical objects (understood to mean a specific sociohistorical community) as one area of emphasis by which cultural contexts enter any given text. The issue I wish to draw attention to is probably the question of how historical objects that stand for particular historical periods can be represented in texts by means of narrative forms. In the manner of Belsey and also this study, this can be understood as raising the crucial question of which narrative structures provided by Byron’s poetry can any given context be represented? This is precisely where culture specific categories of perspective structure, collective voice, collective perspective, and communal voice may find relevance in this study since these are narrative parameters that may stand for a certain historical community, ideology, and may further be used to represent the perspective or voice of a particular community. Even though the argument above calls attention to the fact that narrative strategies have been developed that are instrumental for the investigation of the interlink between narrative theory and issues of contexts in general, a consideration for both narrative and culture specific categories of perspective structure, collective voice, collective perspective, perspective structure, communal voice, narrating non-human agents, narrative forms for the representation of consciousness, metannarative devices, tense categories and narratee signals are yet to be adequately integrated into transgeneric narrative theory of poetry.

From the analysis above, one may assume that there are affinities between the ways narrative enters the text and the ways cultural history and ideology enter the narrative text. These approaches may therefore guide an understanding of narrative forms that suggest that
what narratology can do for the analysis of mediacy of narrative transmission, cultural history can do as well. This question is answered in the project both in theory and in practice.
2. Voice, Focalization and Transgeneric Narratology

The attempt to reconceptualize and analyze narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry by means of narrative forms of which voice, thought forms and perceptual indicators are fundamental has been the concern of both narratology and cultural history. In other words, to say that transgeneric narratology and cultural narratology are related on the level of narration and focalization means also to imply that these approaches have analogous forms of representation. In both narrative theories of mediation, as in cultural narratological thinking, voice mechanisms and forms of focalization are important categories that contribute to the shaping of notions of narrative itself, postcolonial issues and Romanticism in general. Since transgeneric narrative theory and cultural narratology reveal interest in the study of textual subjects by means of linguistic evidence drawn from narration and focalization, their insights can be brought together into an integrated approach to feature an innovative transgeneric model that may be used to account for questions of mediation in poetry analysis. Of importance is the fact that relevant investigations engaging narrative as a central point in the construction of cultural narratology have focused on narrative representations of collective values or cultural communities and ideologies. Narration and focalization can thus become crucial concepts for speaking about the interrelations of different critical disciplines with similar suppositions or agendas.

2.1 Narratorial Voice and Transgeneric Narratology

Any attempt to show that the concept of voice is a crucial one in the intersections between narrative theories of mediation and cultural history may begin with an analysis of categories of agents of mediation provided by narratology. The illusion that communicating agents constitute narrative texts has led narratologies to introduce narrating agents on the story and discourse levels of narrative texts as fundamental categories of mediation. Classical narratology and even some post-classical approaches are concerned with mediation in its emphasis on voice and focalization. In view of the above, they have sought to propose narrative agents that are responsible for narrative communication on the story and discourse levels of a narrative text. While the question of story and discourse would suggest that

79 Toolan (2001 [1988]) defines narration as the ‘individual or position we judge to be the immediate source and authority for what ever words are used in the telling’.
narrative communication is provided by agents on different levels of the story, the impression is that textual agents who include narrators, narrating characters and thinking agents may take many forms depending on the manner in which they tell stories. Genette (1980), Chatman (1978; 1986; 1990a; 1990b), Rimmon-Kenan (1983), Lanser (1992), Cohn (1978), O’Neill (1994), Aczel (1998), Jahn (2005) and many others have shown a concern with voice as a constitutive factor of mediation. The term narratorial voice has been conceptualized following Genette’s attempt to separate narration from focalization. Genette (1980: 186) and other structuralist narratologists including O’Neill (1994: 58-59) and Aczel (1998) conceptualize narrative voice as ‘who speaks?’ or who narrates the story to the addressee, or narratee (as opposed to the focalizer who perceives, dreams, or reflects on events). In the eyes of Lanser, Genette argues that if there is no tale without a teller, then there is no teller without a tale’ (1992: 4). O’Neill (1994: 36-41) joins the debate by posing the question of which ‘actors’ or ‘creatures of discourse, inhabit the story world?’. What one draws from these opinions is the fact that voice refers to the narrator or teller or the agent ‘responsible for the language used in the text, the verbal utterance’, to borrow Hühn’s (2004: 149) phrase. The underlying assumption in the definitions of voice is also the fact that the linguistic speech act by which the narrator is gauged is central in classical and post-classical concepts of narrative mediation.

Secondly, narratologists have considered that most narrative texts constitute both discourse and story levels. Hence, in attempting to account for the different forms narratorial voice assumes, the question that often emerges is whether the particular narrator is external to the narrated world or if he doubles as a character in the world of the story. In his typology of

---

80 For more on the definition of ‘voice’ as agent in the narrative text, who speaks, or who narrates, see Jahn (2005: N3.1.), and Hühn (2004: 149). Closer to Genette (1980) is also Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 88) who argues that '[i]n my view there is always a teller in the tale in the sense that any utterance or record of an utterance presupposes someone who has uttered it’. Stanzel (1981) refines the definition to imply a narrative agent or ‘teller-character’ (as opposed to reflector character) stressing that the main function of the former is to tell, narrate, report, to communicate with the reader, to quote witnesses and sources, to comment on the story, to anticipate the outcome of an action or to recapitulate what has happened before the story opens. When Graesser, Bowers, Bayen and Hu (2001) attempt to provide cognitive and speech forms by which a narrator’s and character’s speech and knowledge can be gauged in a text, they are also raising the important question of the relevance of voice in mediation.

81 Cf. Allrath (2005) that Aczel (1998) offers a detailed discussion of the problems inherent in the notion of narratorial speech and the related concept of voice. I agree with Aczel that the definition ‘who speaks’ does not appear to address the question of how a particular speaker speaks, but I also include context which Aczel did not foreground.

82 See Lanser’s (1992) argument that such concepts would imply that the narrator or speech acts have no existence outside the text.
mediacy which is tailored to answer the question of the forms that agents of action can assume in a narrative text, Stanzel, taking a step further than Genette’s (1980) typologies of mediation, conceptualizes voice or narration in terms of three specific narrative situations - the authorial (heterodiegetic) narrative situation, the first-person (homodiegetic) narrative situation which narratologists have broadened theoretically to include the I-witness, and the I-protagonist or autodiegetic narrator. Another relevant category Stanzel introduced is the figural narrative situation which occurs in both first and third person texts. Lanser has added the category of personal voice. These and other ways story and discourse actors acquire a voice and thus a narrative personality would constitute relevant categories of voice forms by which narration can be analyzed, and by which one can account for the presence of narrativity and contexts in Byron’s poetry.

The category of perspective structure is also suggested by transgeneric narrative theory for the discussion of mediation and contexts in Byron’s poetry (in a similar way as cultural narratology or cultural history provides perspective structure for the discussion of the changing forms narrative can assume in different literary periods). When engaging with questions of narratorial voice or subjects of meaning-making in general from a cultural

---

83 Stanzel (1981: 5) defines mediacy as a generic characteristic that distinguishes narrative from drama, poetry and, as a rule, also from film. Although this definition does not hold true for all cases because poetry tells stories using agents who mediate the stories, his categories of teller and reflector characters that he conceives as two contrary manifestations of what he calls mediacy of presentation would be useful for this study. For more on narratological conceptions of narrative texts as communication and constituted by agents of action on the story and discourse levels, see Chatman (1978), O’Neill (1974: 33-83), and Jahn (2005), among others.

84 In his conception of voice as the narrator’s relationship to the story, Genette (1980) introduces two principal categories of voice: homodiegetic narration (a story narrated by a homodiegetic narrator who is present as a character in the story’s plot) and heterodiegetic narration (understood to mean the teller of the story is situated outside the story’s plot or action).

85 The figural mode, (the reflector) is restrictively defined by Booth (1961) as ‘the third person centers of consciousness’ whose manifestation is by way of mental forms such as dreams, imaginations, reflections, thoughts, among others, is central to narration. The reader’s attention is drawn to the fact that Cohn (1981: 199) challenges Stanzel’s model of mediacy as restricted on grounds that it corresponds only to Genette’s categories of mode and voice. Seeking to modify the lapses in Stanzel’s model of mediation, Cohn emphasizes the issue of narrative levels which Genette (1980: 227-243) also introduces in her chapter on levels and which we shall return to in the section on distinctions. Cohn (1981: 163) thus provides the following relevant modifications: she introduces the third-person external narrator (mode) typical of authorial narration; the third-person reflector (mode), external (FIS) common in dramatic scenes; the third-person reflector (mode) with internal perspective as in figural narration; the first-person reflector (mode) with internal perspective common in interior monologues; the first-person narrator (mode) with internal perspective as in first-person; and first-person narrator (mode) with internal perspective as in peripheral narration. Such distinctions imply that heterodiegetic narration is possible in both first- and third-person texts.

86 See O’Neill (1994: 49) for the use of the phrase in his analysis of what constitutes the process of characterization in a narrative.

87 See Ansgar Nünning (2000; 2001), to which we shall return.
orientation, there needs to be awareness that narrative is an aspect of culture, and constructed from the culture from which it emerges. Hence, one encounters narrative in cultures and vice versa. The reader’s awareness is drawn to the fact that voice involves not only formalist conceptions that often consider the implications of human history and culture from story events (Lanser 1992: 5). Such an argument is only intended to create awareness that one may not adequately conceptualize voice to the exclusion of cultural narratological categories. Lanser introduces what she describes as ‘extra-linguistic’ implications, or ideological representations of voice. Such an argument as the one below: ‘narrative voice, situated at the juncture of social position and literary practice, […] embodies…literary conditions under which it has been produced […]’ (Lanser 1992: 5) supports her claim. This logically leads to further ways of engaging with issues of narration and focalization across disciplinary borders.

If narrative enters the poetic text through forms of mediation theorized under the voice question of ‘who speaks?’, then, in cultural history, it features analogously through ‘particular actors involved in various events at particular times and in particular places’. The question of what forms of voice are available to cultural history and which transgeneric narratology also suggests can be answered by returning to Ansgar Nünning’s category of perspective-structure – which can be useful for the construction of narrators, characters, and focalizers as representations of cultural issues. Lanser’s categories of communal voice, collective voice, personal voice and collective focalization are relevant here. As shall be explained, each category represents not simply a set of structural distinctions, but a particular kind of narrative, narrative consciousness (Lanser 1992: 15) and, one may add, contexts and specific ideologies. The category of communal voice proposed by Lanser may be useful for my integration project because it is capable of showing how ‘readers construct the story, [a narrative], shape it, and even embed it in a world view’ (Lanser 1992: 17) or ideology. My discussion of communal voice is directly linked to personal voice, collective voice, and collective perspective. These categories can be identified in Byron’s “Parisina” and “The Prisoner of Chillon” through the linguistic means by which the Romantic and Post colonial thematic issues of subjects, identity and imprisonment are represented. In the context of this work, formal devices are proposed as means of constructing narrative authority - one that is communal, and can represent a particular community or its identity either through the voice of a single individual or that of a collective as will be demonstrated in my analysis of “The

88 O’Neill (1994: 33) applies this phrase in a different context when he defines stories as the actions of actors in a text.
Prisoner of Chillon”. The narrating voice is in the singular ‘I’ but speaks for the collective especially when he uses the plural ‘we’. The mode of textual representation is the linguistic ‘I’, but it becomes communal voice (‘we’) thereby representing a collective post colonial identity.

The impression created that culture symbolic objects can be turned into textual subjects and empowered with narrative authority or voice (to be relevant for constructing cultural meaning) can be sustained theoretically in this study. If any given object like the Mice and Spiders in Byron’s “The Prisoner of Chillon” take a diegetic name, or participate in action-related sentences or cause actions that introduce narration or perspective into the plot of the story, they can be conceptualized under any of the voice categories proposed by Lanser. Animal objects that one finds in Byron’s narrative verse appear to be a representation of the collective imagination, the voice or perspective of the post colonial community, especially as the poem appears to give information about postcolonial subjects, their identity and the way they view themselves. One may ask what happens when the narrator locates animals in the action of the story. When they get into the plot, and cause plot oriented actions, they are empowered with narrative authority. They may speak in their own voice using the first person individuating I. When they are inclined to speak for the collective, they can deploy the grammatical form ‘we’. The object, like a textual subject or narrator, assumes what Bal (1981a: 147) describes as ‘a diegetical name’ understood to mean that the object is an actor in the story since it plays the role of conveying information to the reader. In postcolonial-oriented writings, these object-subjects are often cultural creatures or subjects, sometimes speaking for their plight or for that of the dispossessed, dehumanized, incarcerated, or voiceless communities. Consequently, the voice or perspective constructed in such cases is often that of the individual or community which the text is representing through narrative forms. As such, objects can be conceptualized in conceptual terms provided by Lanser such as communal voice (an ‘undeveloped or unnamed category’; Lanser 1992: 21). The linguistic element may constitute the forms by which narrative texts epitomize the perspective or voice of the collective community. In the context of this study, therefore, the category of communal voice is one form by which the concept of voice can be said to have some relevance in the reproduction of narrative and post colonial identity. Put differently, communal/collective voice will be relevant for the study’s attempt to provide the various forms for the construction of autobiographical fiction, contexts, and ideology in Byron’s poetry.
Personal voice can enter the category of transgeneric narratology considering that it is apt to link Byron’s narrative poetry to cultural contexts. The urge to construct voice as a culture specific category forces Lanser to provide the concept called personal voice. Lanser’s focus on narrative forms that may be used to reconstruct gender issues of identity cues me to attempt to answer the question of how Byron’s poetry reproduce contexts-sensitive and ideological issues by means of narrative structure. Adopting Lanser’s (1992: 18-19) opinion that personal voice delineates narrators who are self-consciously telling their own histories I propose the self-referential ‘I’ as a grammatical category for constructing personal voice. Similarly, the ‘I’ can be a useful marker for first-person narratives in which the voice that speaks is a participant and thus a homodiegetic narrator. Drawing on Lanser’s argument, the reader notices that personal voice diegetically represented by the ‘I’ linguistic device can be one way of speaking about cultural identity. This is also true of Byron’s legal narrative like “Parisina” in which linguistic or grammatical references feature and allow for conclusive statements about the ways the Greek legal ideology, community, authority and their perspective are located in narrative devices. In addition, I propose the ‘we’ self-referential device as a suitable marking for locating multiple perspectives or collective consciousness of groups or specific communities (Lanser’s 1992 terminology). The ‘we’ or collective protagonist is therefore suited to ‘distinguish the convergence of representation and narration that occurs when a collective or group protagonist is represented through formal strategies that allow the plurality itself to speak’ (Lanser 1992: 256). Following Lanser’s two forms of narrative voice, my use of collective protagonist is also linked to communal voice. “Parisina”, for example, constructs the Greek legal community through such representations in the ‘I’ and ‘we’ forms. Also, the ‘I’ and ‘we’ that stand for personal voice and collective or communal voice respectively will be analyzed as the textual identities of the self silencing post colonial subjects. Linguistic references in the ‘I’ and ‘We’ signals are therefore useful for constructing both contexts and narrative situations in Byron’s poetry. This is the sense in which culture- or context-specific forms of voice can be linked to narration.

Another related and relevant concept that can strengthen investigations on ways of locating cultural contexts in narrative is the category called collective consciousness. Here, as in other examples already given, the ‘I’ may be considered either as an individual or as a collective. The ‘I’, although singular, may be perceived as representing the thoughts or

89 I adopt Lanser’s (1992: 256) argument that a collective protagonist does not necessarily entail communal voice (though it is possible) since novels use multiple voices, but without constructing a community.
perception of the collective. In that case he or she can be regarded as a plural voice that narrates or represents collective perspective. Simultaneous consciousness or voice may thus be used to designate a narrative situation in which both voice and focalization are represented as communal, so that “the ‘we’ who perceives is also the ‘we’ who speaks” (Lanser 1992: 257). When the first-person narrator individualizes him or herself in a plurality of voice or consciousness, he is constructing, first, his individual identity, or possibly a collective one and in the context of this study, a particular kind of narrative authority. The ‘we’ of “Parisina” not only incorporates but also represents the institutionalized legal community and authority that makes decisions; the ‘we’ of “The Prisoner of Chillon” represents the post colonial perspective and identity and may be said to be a narrative construction of a larger post colonial community or collective identity of subjects. I am suggesting that when a narrator narrates from what Lanser describes as plural consciousness, or plural narration, he or she can be identified or conceptualized in the ‘we’ or ‘I’ marking.

A transgeneric narrative approach focusing on the strategies that evolve from the link between Byron’s poetry and culture should focus on perspective structure in which voice and focalization play crucial roles. Perspective structure enters narrative mediation by means of the narrative categories of narrators, focalizers, and characters. Classical narratology posits that perspective structure can provide analytical and interpretive strategies for use in narrative texts that tell stories using narrators and focalizers as their medium. Cultural narratology argues that reading narrative texts in the light of perspective structure ‘can provide analytical tools for illuminating the ways in which formal properties of the late 19th- and early 20th-century novels reflect both the understanding of the reality of the time and the epistemological, moral, and ideological concerns of the period’ (Ansgar Nünning 2000: 364). As Ansgar Nünning has pointed out in his insightful synthesis of narratology and cultural history, ‘[t]he concept of perspective structure provides a new approach to the study of narrators, focalizers, and characters which have been emptied of their semantic content[…]’

90 For other areas that can be relevant to a context-sensitive and historically-oriented cultural narratology proposed by Ansgar Nünning (2001), see unreliable narration, plot patterns, dialogues, and descriptions.

91 Cf. Ansgar Nünning’s (2001: 207) argument that Stanzel has used the term ‘perspective’ to imply narrative situation. Chatman (1978; 1986) uses it to refer to focalization and the structure of narrative transmission, while Genette (1980), Mieke Bal (1985), and Hühn (2004), one may add, link the term to focalization theories. While I agree that narratology employs the term ‘perspective’ to cover issues regarding narrative situations, mediation and focalization theories, I adopt Ansgar Nünning’s (2001: 207) opinion that perspective can also apply to the description of the semantic content of narratives, namely to the world-models of the fictional individuals that populate the represented universe projected by narrative texts. In this specific context, therefore, I use perspective in the light of Ansgar Nünning’s concept to mean a character’s or a narrator’s subjective worldview, conceptualized as character-perspective and narrator-perspective.
by structuralism’. According to Ansgar Nünning (2000: 364), the study of perspective-structure of English novels would be relevant for a contextually and diachronically oriented narratology ‘since it can provide a new approach to the study of narrators, focalizers, and characters, all of which have been emptied of their semantic content by structuralism [...]’

What is important is the fact that categories such as narrators, focalizers, and characters are studied both in narratology and cultural history through linguistic and other representations of mediation. When Palmer (2002: 40) states that post-classical narratology should systematically explore the evidence available in novels or both the role of the narrator in mediating the relationship between the minds and their social contexts, he can be understood, in the light of Ansgar Nünning’s assumption, to say that people can only create cultural contexts by means of narrative parameters. One may also add that narrative and cultural history are reproduced through forms of representations which are inextricably linked to narratorial voice and focalization. Forms of perspective like character-perspective and narrator-perspective that such arguments invoke will be deployed in my study as useful analytical tools in the discussion of how narrative situations and contexts are reproduced. The concept of perspective-structure not only links this study to cultural history. Most importantly, its categories of character-perspective and narrator-perspective are relevant for my analysis of mediation and their different functions in narrative transmission as far as Byron’s poetry is concerned. Van Peer and Chatman (2001: 7) argue that in order to understand the ways in which narratives shape and constitute our cultural world, we will have to develop more accurate textual devices that create a perspective. According to them, a starting point for such a discussion would be to ask the question, ‘What is the perspective in this story?’ rather than ‘How is perspective in this story brought about?’ (7). Such a question comes up my analysis of how Byron’s poetry can reproduce cultural history.

In his theory of the perspective-structure of narrative texts, Ansgar Nünning (2001: 210) cites the constructivist position on perspective which holds that ‘perspective focuses on the structural devices of narrative texts for foregrounding the subjectivity, perspectivity, and constructivity of experience, recollection, cognition, and emotion’. This definition has an important implication for the way narrative perspective is employed in Byron’s poetic texts to designate communication. Seeking to propose ways by which a narrative may inform readers about character-perspective and narrator-perspective, he argues that ‘each verbal utterance and each physical or mental act of a character provides insight into his or her perspective’ (210). Following Ansgar Nünning, the study suggests that categories for representing the mind can be useful tools for probing the issue of how perspective can allow for assumptions
about any given narrative situation and also context in a narrative text. In narrative poetry, characters and narrators often serve to represent not only fictional worlds, but also real human beings and contexts. A narrative text may construct not only one fictional world, but what Ansgar Nünning describes as ‘a range of subjective perspectives’, ‘a number of subworlds’ (2000: 263), and hence ‘a plurality of represented worlds’ analogous to those of real human beings. Since characters and narrators are often the analytical tools to account for such a range of perspectives, and since the reader encounters them through formal devices, subjective worlds can find textual representations by means of the mental activities of these agents. One however needs to differentiate between the perspective of the character and that of the narrator.

According to Ansgar Nünning (2001: 210) a character-perspective is defined as a fictional agent’s subjective world view. What a character does whether physical or mental may allow room to determine his or her perspective. One needs to further specify the fundamental characteristics of the verbal utterance, the physical and mental acts by which a character’s world-view can be accounted for.92 Following Nünning’s (2001: 211) emphasis that the concept of character-perspective incorporates everything that exists in the mind of a character, I suggest that a person’s ‘knowledge, abilities, motivations, needs, intentions, expectations, psychological and physical states, the general economic, political, social, and cultural conditions under which he or she lives’93, ‘individual’s knowledge and belief sets, intentions, psychological traits, attitudes, ideological stance, and systems of values and norms’ would be preconditions for an analysis of character-perspective, and thus for the construction of a narrative situation in the first-person. Since areas of the mind dealing with emotions and dispositions fall under character perspective, the notion of character-perspective may be refined by the parameters proposed by Palmer (2002) to investigate the fictional mind.94 Palmer (2002: 32) argues that, when we talk about fictional consciousness, we are

---

92 Ansgar Nünning (2001: 211) has proposed the inclusion of empirical personality theories in the study of literary characters, arguing that the ‘narrative universe of a text contains […] a number of subworlds, created by the mental activity of characters […]’, a ‘plurality of represented worlds […]’

93 See Ansgar Nünning (2001: 211).

94 Apparently adopting McHale’s (1981: 185) position that despite existing categories for analysing mental forms, there is still a sizeable block of undifferentiated prose left, Palmer proposes his theory of the mind to account for the mental and extra-mental mind forms that speech category and consciousness strategies cannot account for. I do not employ the concept ‘theory of the mind’ as a synonym for concepts narratology has provided for the investigation of the inner world of characters such as focalization, free indirect speech, interior monologue, stream of consciousness and other mental and speech categories provided by classical narratology.
excluding other psychic levels like behavior, emotions, latent states such as dispositions, and beliefs that consciousness mechanisms cannot sufficiently cover. Since the definition of character-perspective supplied by Ansgar Nünning also takes psychological components of the character’s mental life into consideration, and given that perspective is sometimes defined by cognitive activities, Palmer’s categories for the analysis of the minds of fictional characters need to be resorted to. The categories proposed by Palmer (2002: 31) for analyzing a character’s state of mind and which are useful for this study include mental phenomena such as mood, desires, emotions, sensations, visual images, attention, memory, dispositions, beliefs, attitudes, judgements, skills, knowledge, imagination, intellect, volition, character traits, habits of thought, intentions, purpose, motives and behavior.95 To propose such mind forms including extra-mental categories for the analysis of character-perspective is to imply that they constitute ways by which the perspective or subjective world-view of a character can be constructed.

The parameters for constructing character-perspective as analyzed above can construct a narrative situation in the first-person. Ansgar Nünning (2001) argues that ‘subjective judgements, opinions, emotions, and beliefs, irrespective of whether they are erroneous or not, are an integral part of character-perspective’96. Since a homodiegetic narrated text features an external narrative level, an attempt to apply the concept of perspective-structure to the analysis of mediation in narrative poetry should also consider this level.97 Following this argument, character perspectives can be highlighted in two ways. The reader needs to consider that first-person narratives usually involve two main perspectives: the perspective of the experiencing ‘I’ and that of the narrating ‘I’.98 The narrator-perspective which corresponds to the perspective of the narrating ‘I’ represents the private domain of the homodiegetic narrator, whose worldview is conditioned by knowledge, psychological dispositions, attitudes, and values of the narrating ‘I.’ Telling the story in retrospect and knowing its outcome, the

95 See also David Herman’s (2005: 4) argument that humans are defined by love, desires, passions, and hate. See also his theory of cognition (2003) by which he attempts to link narratology to cognition, arguing that narratology functions as a tool for thinking.

96 Ansgar Nünning (2001: 212) makes a distinction between subjective perspective and character-perspective when he argues that the actual textual world as constructed by the reader guarantees the understanding that the world of fictional facts need not be accurately reflected in the mental representations constructed by a character: ‘the concept of factual domain, or actual world, […] is made up of what exists absolutely in the semantic universe of the text, as opposed to what exists in the minds of characters […]’.

97 Ansgar Nünning justifies this point by saying that narrators are also endowed with a range of individuating features.

98 The perspective of the experiencing ‘I’ corresponds to the character-perspective while that of the narrating ‘I’ refers to the narrator-perspective.
narrating ‘I’ has a wider perspective than the narrated or experiencing ‘I’ who previously inhabited the time and space of the story level.\textsuperscript{99} What is important in the analysis of perspective in homodiegetic narration is the fact that, since ‘the first-person narrator remembers what the experiencing ‘I’ knew, experienced, thought, and felt, the character-perspective of the experiencing I is embedded in the cognitive domain of the narrating I’ (Ansgar Nünning 2001: 218). Any analysis of perspective-structure in homodiegetic narration would therefore consider cognitive devices that signal the recollections of the homodiegetic narrator.\textsuperscript{100}

Narrator-perspective in authorial narration is one way of accounting for the role of perspective in rendering narration. The concept of narrator-perspective holds true only for narrators with individuating traits.\textsuperscript{101} Since constructing narrator-perspective demands that the narrator must posses individuating traits, it seems logical to restrict the analysis of what Ansgar Nünning calls narrator-perspective to overt narrators whose individual perspective or world-view is analogous to ‘those private domains of the participants in the story’, called character-perspective.\textsuperscript{102} The heterodiegetic overt narrator or personalized narrator can follow the characters where there is action and, conventionally, he is capable of knowing their minds. Logically, in authorial narration, there can be a hierarchy of perspectives with the result that the character-perspective can be embedded in the narrator-perspective ‘and with the narrator functioning as a controlling, coordinating, and integrating instance’ (Ansgar Nünning 2001: 220). Any analysis of perspective in Byron’s poems that construct authorial heterodiegetic personalized narration should therefore focus on the authorial narrator’s hindsight, evaluations, and comments on what the characters feel, think, imagine, and what they believe.


\textsuperscript{100} The point has been emphysized by Ansgar Nünning (2001: 219) that ‘despite the advantages of hindsight, the narrating I is never omniscient’ and ‘his or her perspective tend to be partial, biased, or even distorted as a result of the cognitive limitations and inherent subjectivity of the mind’.

\textsuperscript{101} Cf. Ansgar Nünning (2001: 213-214). It should be noted that the concept of narrator-perspective is relevant only for what Chatman (1978: 33; 197-262) calls ‘overt narrators,’ not for ‘covert’ narratorial instances or impersonal voices.

\textsuperscript{102} The differences in the reader’s construction of character-perspective and those by which the narrator’s beliefs, attitudes, and systems of values are reconstructed are provided by Ansgar Nünning (2001: 214): ‘While the reader constructs the perspectives of the various characters on the basis of what the narrator tells him or her about the characters’ physical, verbal, and mental acts, a narrator-perspective manifests itself solely in what he or she says, that is, in the discourse that, reflects the contents of his or her mind […]’ On the question of what parameters need to be taken into consideration for the construction of perspective in both cases, Ansgar Nünning (2001: 215) proposes gender, generation differences, social class, race, social, moral, ideological factors, semantic aspects, interest focus (216), monologic and dialogic forms of perspective (217).
they know or do not know in the eyes of (Ansgar Nünning 2001: 220). A discussion on the categories of narratorial voice by which different types of perspectives and their strategies of reference would apply in the analysis of narration leads directly to another crucial area of the study concerned with how one can identify a given narrator or focalizer in a narrative situation specifically in poems that tell stories.

2.2 Transgeneric Narratology and Mediation: Strategies of Discrimination

*What do we know of a textual narrator when all we get is lines of print? Can such a narrator have a voice, and if so, how can it become manifest in a text [...] which textual elements in particular project a narrative voice?*

Jahn (2005: N1.3., N1.4.)

*The uttering of an utterance presupposes an utterer, (the thinking of a thought a thinker, the perceiving of a perception a perceiver).*

Moshe Ron (1981: 26)

The question of whether narratology, and one may add transgeneric narratological theory of mediation, can ‘contribute anything of practical value’\(^{103}\) to the analysis of narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry may be attempted if one makes recourse to both the differential and analytical tools provided by transgeneric narratology, which integrates the findings of Structuralist narratology and the new post-classical narratology - specifically cultural narrative theory. Narratological attempts to systematize or conceptualize narrative texts as communication have triggered the illusion that different narrating agents and focalizers inhabit the story and discourse at different levels in any given text. In order to say that one narrative situation is different from another, attention needs to be directed towards narrative strategies that may shed light on the differences between the various agents in a narrative communication\(^{104}\) act. Of importance is the fact that when one attempts to analyze narrative texts as mediation, one is drawing the reader’s attention to the existence of different agents and focalizers in the narrative text. The question of whether narratology, and one may add transgeneric narratological theory of mediation, can ‘contribute anything of practical value’\(^{103}\) to the analysis of narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry may be attempted if one makes recourse to both the differential and analytical tools provided by transgeneric narratology, which integrates the findings of Structuralist narratology and the new post-classical narratology - specifically cultural narrative theory. Narratological attempts to systematize or conceptualize narrative texts as communication have triggered the illusion that different narrating agents and focalizers inhabit the story and discourse at different levels in any given text. In order to say that one narrative situation is different from another, attention needs to be directed towards narrative strategies that may shed light on the differences between the various agents in a narrative communication\(^{104}\) act. Of importance is the fact that when one attempts to analyze narrative texts as mediation, one is drawing the reader’s attention to the existence of different agents and focalizers in the narrative text.


\(^{104}\) Cf. Allrath (2005: 22). Allrath holds that the understanding of narrative texts as communication is at the basis of many narratological analyses. For an introductory discussion on narrative communication, see Coste (1989) and Ansgar Nünning (1989), and one may add Nünning/ Nünning (2004).
categories of narrators and focalizers. If a narrative text contains different levels of communication, one may not be wrong to adopt Allrath’s (2005: 22) opinion that it is only through specification and distinction that the reader becomes aware of the agents that participate in a narrative communication act. Moshe Ron’s argument that if something is uttered, thought, or perceived, there is a teller, a thinker, or a perceiver presupposes the fact that in a narrative text, there exists a teller (narrator) or thinker (reflector or perceiving character) performing different roles as agents of communication and needs to be specified and distinguished. The particular image of the communicating agent as a reflector, focalizer (perceiver), or even speaker with a distinct textual voice and perspective implies that the manner in which communicating agents tell their stories not only differs, but is also responsible for their forms of textual manifestations and functions. The emphasis on concepts such as narrator, voice, thinker, and perceiver (focalizer) also has a bearing on transgeneric narrative theory of poetry and are important indicators of the study’s attempt to explore certain differential forms of narratorial voice, thought patterns, and perceptual forms that passed unnoticed in Hühn’s approach to mediacy on which this study draws. Before the study concerns itself with the question of which textual elements would project or signalize a given narrator or focalizer, a relevant remark is necessary.

The categories of authorial narrative situation (heterodiegetic), the first-person forms (homodiegetic, autodiegetic, narrating ‘I’, experiencing ‘I’, and personal voice), and figural mode in which the reflector is often the central character, are fundamental narrative situations that the narrative verse constructs for which interpretive, differential and analytical tools postulated by Hühn (2004, 2005) in transgeneric narrative theory of poetry have proved less relevant. Byron’s narrative verse, both in the first- and third-person forms, displays a variety of narrating agents and focalizers on discourse and story levels of texts. The reader is likely to find its narrative communication almost compatible with that of narrative (prose) fiction characterized by extradiegetic and intradiegetic narrators and focalizers who, often exhibit textual signals analogous to dialogic or polyphonic narration.

We now turn to propose

---

105 Nünning/Nüning (2004: 19) point to the problems that may arise from the use of the term ‘narrator’, especially when it is used to refer to characters who happen to narrate something for other characters on the level of action, and proposed ‘narrating characters’ to guide an understanding of the narrator as distinct from a character who tells a story.

106 Bakhtin (1981) uses the terms ‘polyphony’ or ‘dialogism’ in relation to novels that construct many voices. The concept of dialogism can also be usefully applied in transgeneric narratological conceptions of narration and focalization by resorting to the narratological concepts of voice, perspective, and focalization. This is especially so in cases where a narrative mode or sentence may reveal the presence of two styles in a single identity, making it impossible to speak about the underlying differences or narrative categories involved.
differential and analytical clues to voice and focalization as a starting point. Such an attempt may of bridge conceptual restrictions discernible in poetry criticism, specifically in the approach to mediation. The differential and analytical clues will be drawn from the insights of classical, post-classical narratologies including the transgeneric narratological framework. Such modifications will also allow narrative poetry and its deficient methodology of mediaicy to benefit from the well-defined and systematic methodology of narratology, and will eventually lead to new modifications, new questions, and apparently unprecedented developments in the poetic theory of transgeneric narratology. This section therefore aims to concentrate on the criteria for identification and differentiation within narrative communication in poetry.

Since the aim of this study is also to show my point of departure from the limits of recent conceptualizations on narration and focalization provided by Hühn, an attempt to introduce further differential and analytical clues to mediation into transgeneric narrative theory of poetry may be incomplete without due consideration for narrative categories of level, person, degree of participation, (un)reliability, tense, mode, omniscient and omnipresent privileges. These central elements will play a great role in helping the reader to determine underlying differences between narrators, thinkers, reflectors or a given focalizer and their levels in a narrative text. The study will therefore draw on these criteria in the attempt to show how the range of narratorial voices and also levels of focalization can be distinguished and analyzed.107

As a first step to answer the question of categorical distinctions in narrative communication in any given poetic text, one needs to take into consideration the level on

---

Combined levels of voice or focalization play a part in the analysis of narrative communication in some of Byron’s poems. See, for instance, the juxtaposition of intradiegetic and extradiegetic levels, or extradiegetic and homodiegetic levels in “Giaour”, “Lara”, “The Corsair” etc. See also the juxtaposition of character and narrator-perspectives and of the narrating and experiencing selves in some fragments of “Childe Harold” III, or even multiperspectivity of figural thought and the heterodiegetic narrator’s voice in some of these and other poems. My argument is that, if the appropriate differential markers for voice and focalization are provided, it may be easier for the reader to make systematic descriptions and distinctions of narratorial voice and focalization in Byron’s poetry as well as to interpret the poems in terms of their functionality.

One needs to draw the reader’s attention to the fact that some of the suggested clues for distinction and analysis of narration and focalization perform similar roles or maintain the same identities in different narrative situations and may therefore allow for what Rimmon-Kenan describes as ‘cross combinations between the different types’ (1983: 94). Genette questions those distinctions. Other critics including Cohn have shown that most techniques and strategies induce a fusion between narrative situations by blurring the line that separates them. My argument is that these embedded levels with the potential for double role effects are productive in revealing the extent to which Byron’s poetry provides forms for narrative construction of meaning.
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which the agent performing the act of narration or focalization is located. The distinction based on level takes into account the fact that narrators, like focalizers, are located on the different levels of a narrative text and are attributed different textual identities or names. Beginning with focalization, the reader needs to be told that its typologies have been named based on the criteria of the level of communication on which a given focalizer is located. Like other narratologists, Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 71-85) has conceptualized focalization under two major terms: ‘external’, understood to mean the focalizing subject or narrator focalizer is located on the level of narrative transmission, and ‘internal’, if the focalizer or character focalizer is placed on the story level of the text. The criterion of level is relevant to focalization because it may help the reader to determine whether the narrative is focalized from the perspective of the character inside the story, or from the narrator external to the story. Whatever type of focalization a reader is likely to construct will then be guided by a consideration of the level of communication on which the focalizer is located. Level is also relevant to narration especially if the reader takes into consideration the fact that communication usually involves extradiegetic and intradiegetic speakers, or homodiegetic and heterodiegetic narrators who are often of different identities. This logically incites the explanation that ‘when attempting to analyze and differentiate between narrating instances, to enable an insight into their textual manifestations and functions, we must begin by distinguishing the various levels of a narrative text’\footnote{For the use of the phrase, see Nünning/Nünning (2004: 119).}. Narratologists, beginning with Genette (1980: 228-229), have agreed on the importance of the category of narrative level on which a particular narrator operates as unavoidable when distinguishing between narrators since the reader meets narrators, narrating characters and reflectors in different narrative situations.\footnote{See also O’Neill’s (1994: 60) argument that every narrator is part of a particular narrative reality or diegesis.} Narratorial differentiation that takes level into account necessarily begins with the question whether narrators and their former selves (experiencing ‘I’ and the narrating ‘I’) double as characters on the level of action (homodiegetic narrators), or if they remain outside the narrated world as heterodiegetic narrators. The differentiation based on level often takes into consideration the fact that ‘extradiegetic narrators’ are located on the level of narrative transmission and, together with a fictive addressee, constitute the narrative process whereas intradiegetic narrators are located inside the story (Allrath 2005: 31-32). Nünning/Nünning (2004: 111) have identified level as a useful and relevant criterion for any attempt to discuss features that are unique to a given narrator:
With regard to the identity of the narrator, a significant aspect is whether or not he or she is involved in action on the same level as other characters. To answer these questions it is important to determine whether the narrated world is presented from the external perspective of the narrator, or from the internal perspective of the characters involved in the action.

According to the explanation above, a narrator who is located on the level of narrative transmission and narrates from a position outside the story would be assumed to be an extradiegetic narrator according to Genette’s terminology. Characters or the ‘narrating instance’ that is part of the narrated story, positioned on the story level and also ‘produces a narrative is an intradiegetic narrator’ (O’Neill 1994: 60). Most narratologists, including Rimmon-Kenan (1983) and O’Neill (1994) describe the extradiegetic narrative as a first-degree narrative while the intradiegetic is conceived of as a second-degree narrative. If a character in the second-degree narrative produces a further narrative (a narrative that is embedded in the second-degree narrative), it would be a hyponarrative. What the criteria of level makes one see is the fact that, ‘in contrast to first-person narrators, authorial narrators, like the characteristically covert narrators in figural narrative situations, are situated outside the world of the characters’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 112). What Nünning/Nünning, like Genette, O’Neill and other narratologists prepare the reader to see is the fact that, whether the reader is engaging with questions of voice or focalization, the level of communication on which the teller (speaker) or reflector whose thoughts the narrative world is projecting, is of paramount significance in determining the kind of focalizer, thinker, narrator or narrative situation in any given text. Since story telling can occur on many levels, level may be useful in classifying focalizers and narrators, leading to an understanding of their forms and functions in the lyric. The hierarchy of narrative levels and their respective reference terms provided by Genette and other narratologists are important for the classification of narrators and focalizers, and for speaking about the features that make each distinct from the other. Such a criterion would be useful in analyzing and distinguishing between focalizers and narrators in narrative poems including “Don Juan”, “The Giaour”, “The Corsair” and others that construct diegetic and extradiegetic narrators or homodiegetic and heterodiegetic categories. In specific and complex cases in the first-person (autodiegetic narration) where the

---

110 Nünning/Nünning (2004: 119) argue that the fictive addressee is also located on the extradiegetic level of narrative communication performing the analogous role of narrating.

111 See Genette’s (1980: 229) terminology. Following Genette (1980), Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 91; 96-98) and also Wallace Martin (1986: 135) differentiate narrators depending on whether he or she is extradiegetic or intradiegetic, or whether he or she is a participant in the story or not.
narrator is one and the same person, yet moving under two separate identities, namely the experiencing ‘I’ and the narrating ‘I’, the criterion may be inadequate since they are all situated on the same level inside the story. There is, thus, the need for further criteria to specify and differentiate narrators and focalizers in a narrative communication act.

Individuating or personalized\textsuperscript{112} clues may enable the reader to come to terms with the crucial problem of specification and categorical distinctions in narrative communication in poetry. Since the reader meets focalizers, narrators and narrating characters in different narrative situations, on different levels, and in different identities, they are often differentiated by a number of personalized markers. In the case of homodiegetic narration understood to mean the narrator is inside the story on action oriented sentences, the character-focalizer or the experiencing ‘I’ is identified in the same ‘I’-reference as the narrating ‘I’. To say that the narrating persona of a text is the narrating ‘I’ is to imply that among its story related action sentences, there are some that contain first-person pronouns, ‘indicating that the narrator was at least a witness to the events depicted’ (Jahn 2005: N1.11). The narrating ‘I’ who takes part in the fictional world as the experiencing ‘I’ (although separated only by a moral distance as is often identified by the first person ‘I’ marker) (cf. Nünning/Nünning 2004: 111). In contrast, other internal focalizers are identified by third-person pronominal markers –‘he’ or ‘she’. Like in focalization, the category of personalized references may also be useful for marking narration in the first, third and authorial narrative situations. In the authorial heterodiegetic narrative situation, like in first-person forms, self-reference in the linguistic ‘I’ form is important for identifying the narrator of a given text as authorial. The point I am making is that first-person narrators often refer to themselves in first-person forms as ‘I’, ‘me’, and ‘we’. In contrast to first-person narration, in authorial narration and the figural mode, narration is often distinguished by third-person references such as ‘he’ or ‘she’. However, in the manner of first-person narrators, overt third-person authorial narrators also identify themselves as ‘I’, the only difference being that, unlike the first-person homodiegetic narrators, authorial narrators are located in discourse outside the story. Traditional distinctions of first- person, second-person and third-person are apt to account for the different forms narrators and focalizers can assume in different narrative situations. The distinctions based on person are misleading however because both first-person homodiegetic narrators and third-person authorial narrators (overt) sometimes identify themselves as ‘I’. Secondly, the criterion

\textsuperscript{112} For more on individualized references as differential markers, see Lothe (2000: 23), Nünning/Nünning (2004) and Stanzel (1971).
of distinction based on person is not only deceptive, but also unsystematic. One therefore needs to specify how the reader can look for signs of an authorial narrator in a text where he or she is present, but not textually marked. The distinction based on person is quite visible in the third-person texts and in the first-person forms where narrators are referred to in the third-person and in the first-person respectively, but tend to be blurred in the same forms. Thus, person criteria can cause confusion. It is because of this confusion that the criterion has not gone unchallenged.\footnote{Wallace Martin (1986: 135) joins the debate, arguing that third-person narrators refer to all characters in the third person, adding that the category can also include the authorial narrative situation in which there is no reference to the ‘I’ - presumably what Stanzel calls ‘figural narrative situation’ or reflector character. The confusion becomes clearer when one notices that the third-person narrative situation can be overt (authorial heterodiegetic when they take an individualized reference) and covert (the figural mode belongs here, but also the authorial when a narrator narrates without any self-identifying references). Although Booth restricts his analysis to the implied author (the author’s second self as distinct from the real man; 1961: 151), he proposes the ‘undramatized’ (no personal characteristics) and the ‘dramatized’ to indicate a narrative situation with individuating traits as a suitable criterion. See also Genette’s categories of mode, distance, and person. Cohn’s (1981: 165) contribution to this debate implicates both third-person and first-person homodiegetic narration as she points to the nuances often featured by two very different situations or agents, which grammar renders identical. Cohn also points out that authorial narrators, like first-person narrators, also refer to themselves as ‘I’, the only difference being that, unlike the first-person homodiegetic narrators, they are often outside the action on the level of discourse.} It becomes difficult to make categorical differentiation based on individualized references especially in the case of homodiegetic narrators. A typical example occurs in homodiegetic narration when ‘the narrator’s character is in effect split into two different manifestations of the same self, one who narrates and one who experiences (or focalizes)’.\footnote{See Cohn (1978) and also Allrath (2005: 23) in a footnote.} In this type of homodiegetic narration, both the narrating ‘I’ and the experiencing ‘I’, i.e., the narrator and his/her former self, double as character although, in narratological terms, they are two separate agents. It is in this sense that the ‘I’ complicates any attempt at distinction based on person categories. It is for this reason that Wayne Booth (1961: 149-150) challenges the traditional classification of ‘point of view’ and such terms as ‘first-person’ and ‘omniscience’ as inadequate because of lack of specifications about how ‘they differ from each other’ in terms of particular qualities and effects. Such an argument not only underscores Booth’s interest in making distinctions, but foregrounds the problems of distinction that may be posed by the category of person as a distinguishing criterion for narrative situations. In other words, many crucial problems arise when one attempts to make distinctions based on the criterion of persons. In another example, when one refers to a third-person narrator as ‘she’, ‘he’, or ‘they’, it is not clear whether one is speaking about the authorial or the figural third-person since two categories of third-person texts are all marked by personal pronouns in the third-person. Again, if the personal pronoun ‘I’ marks the first–
person homodiegetic and the third-person heterodiegetic narrators, one is likely to wonder – as Jacob Lothe (2000) does - how the authorial overt narrator can or should be identified. This is where the criteria of narrative level and participation may prove their worth, granted that the third-person heterodiegetic narrator can use the ‘I’ reference without having to enter the action as participant (Lothe 2000: 22). Booth is right, then. Classical distinctions do not address the question of whether or not intermediary levels exist and what criteria are suitable to come to terms with distinctions based on such levels. Instances where the authorial narrator refers to himself as ‘I’ as in “Don Juan”, and even those in which individuating traits are not provided, as in fragments of the “The Corsair” and “Lara”, may mislead the reader in any attempt to analyze narrative communication based on person. I am drawing attention to the fact that firstly, person category may be relevant only to a limited extent, and secondly, that it needs precision and conceptualization to qualify as a useful criterion for distinctions.

A closely related criterion that may constitute a textual basis for saying that a given narrator is different from others is what Stanzel, in Lothe’s eyes (2000: 21), conceptualizes under such terms as ‘existential’ and ‘experienced.’ Stanzel does not only stress the need for the distinction between third-person and first-person narrators, but postulates a remedial criterion based on existence and participation in the plot. The distinction provided by Stanzel comes down to the reader thanks to Lothe (2001: 21) in the following words:

The contrast between an embodied narrator and a narrator without such bodily determination, that is to say, between a first-person narrator and an authorial third-person narrator, accounts for the most important difference in the motivation of the narrator to narrate. For an embodied narrator, this motivation is existential; it is directly connected with his practical experiences, with his joys and sorrows he has experienced, with his moods and needs [...]. For the third-person narrator, on the other hand, there is no existential compulsion to narrate. His motivation is literary-aesthetic rather than existential.

One thing clearly stands out in Stanzel’s distinction, noticeable in his differential key terms – ‘existential’ and ‘experienced’. The term ‘existential’ positions the first-person narrator as an active participant in the story’s plot, that is, in the dynamic shaping of the text’s action, events, and characters (Lothe 2000: 21). In contrast to the first-person narrator, the third-person narrator does not enter the plot and remains ‘outside’ the fictional world. Since a purely linguistic criterion for a distinction between the two narrative situations based on the person has proved insufficient, Stanzel’s criterion, which is a combination of first-person and active plot engagement (in the manner described by Lothe, 24), may be helpful in marking the narrator as homodiegetic as distinct from the authorial who never participates in the plot.
The degree of participation or explicit appearance (which is related to the criteria of personalized references) in a narrative text has been one useful criterion for understanding key distinctions between the different narrators a text can construct and needs to enter the plethora of transgeneric-narratological categories for distinction. Any narratological attempt to identify and separate narrating agents based on the degree of participation should consider that categories of overtness and covertness determine the extent to which any given narrator appears in a text, and therefore becomes a determining criterion for their differentiation. Chatman (1978) regards covert and overt forms of narratorial voice as inevitable in the process of interpretation and distinctions in narrative communication. In line with the criterion based on the degree of participation, Genette broadens these differential categories to include homodiegetic and heterodiegetic narrators. The fundamental question of the extent to which a given narrator appears in the text is crucial for the understanding of covertness and overtness. It is in this sense that Nünning/Nünning (2004: 119-120) outline useful factors to be considered in any attempt to analyze and differentiate narratorial voice based on participation:

If a narrator appears on the level of the narrative transmission as an individualized speaker and concrete persona, he or she is described as an ‘overt’ (or ‘explicit’) narrator [...] The reader is encouraged to attribute personal characteristics and value judgements to such a speaker. If, however, narrating instances take the form of anonymous voices, about which the readers are given no information, then they are described as ‘covert’ (or ‘neutral’) narrators.

What the above criterion, anticipating Genette, makes clear is the fact that a narrator who names him/herself is easily identified in the personal references. Genette’s categorical distinction, which follows Structuralist criteria, is very relevant for my project in terms of typology and analytical relevance.\(^\text{115}\) Besides offering a systematic substitute for such vague traditional references as first, second and third person, the criterion relies on the degree of involvement in action and allows the reader to speak of differences between narrators by means of reference conceptual terms. These categories of homodiegetic and heterodiegetic narrators can in theory and analysis provide basic insight into the ways different narrators can

\(^{115}\) It should be noted, however, that Genette’s categorical distinctions carry with them limitations for an analysis of mediation in general. First, within the first-person narrative situation there are intermediary levels which Genette did not anticipate (but which have relevance for this study, and which both Stanzel and Cohn attempt to analyze). We shall return to this issue of intermediary levels in due course. Genette pays attention to the question of level through the criteria of mode and voice. Her categories of voice and person are linked to the homodiegetic and heterodiegetic levels. While the category of mode branches into distance and focalization. As useful as this may seem, the categorical separation of voice (person) into homodiegetic and heterodiegetic does not make clear the place of the reflector mode which occurs in authorial covert figural third-person mode and in first-person forms by means of interior monologues.
be constructed, may enable the study to analyze narrative poems which structures mediation based on internal and external narrators.

The degree of narratorial presence in any given text is not only conveyed by such categories as ‘overt’ and ‘covert’ narrators, but also their functions, and needs to be treated together. Considering that both overt and covert signals are ‘voice makers’ in Jahn’s opinion (2005: N27.1.4.), they need attention in the study. Chatman (1978: 222) argues that to label narrators as covert or overt is to imply that a certain feature marks a boundary between two kinds of narrators. Along the same line, Nünning/Nünning (2004) seem to say that any attempt to differentiate between narrating instances on the level of narrative transmission should consider the crucial question of whether the agent in question appears in the text as an ‘explicit’ narrator or not. Since the functions performed by any given narrator are necessarily markers of identification, they need to be revisited briefly. Following this criterion, an overt narrator identifies him/herself in first person references (‘I’, ‘we’ etc.), directly or indirectly addresses the narratee, and also ‘intrudes’ into the story to make philosophical or metanarrative comments, and thus has a ‘distinct voice.’ On the other hand, a narrator ‘who neither refers to him-or herself nor addresses any narratee’, is indistinct in terms of voice and sex would be a covert narrator. If we go by Allrath’s (2005: 22) argument, following Rimmon-Kenan’s (1983: 96) that the ‘narrator’s degree of ‘perceptibility’ is directly linked to the functions he or she fulfills in a narrative act, then the criterion of overtness/covertness may guide the reader to find the identity of a particular narrator and eventually determine the origin of utterances, opinions, judgements, thoughts and attitudes which are all important parameters when making distinctions or describing narrative communication. Covert narration will be relevant for my discussion of authorial narration in both contexts of authorial narration and the figural mode, while overt markers will be useful when dealing with any given text that constructs individualized narrators. The criterion of covert/overt forms of narratorial voice will be useful when accounting for the forms and differences that underlie authorial heterodiegetic narration, homodiegetic narration and

116 See Chatman (1978) and also Stanzel’s overt mediacy attributed to teller character and covert mediacy used in relation to the reflector.

117 For this emphasis, see Jahn (2005: N3.1.4).

118 For more on functions that narrators can fulfil, and which have consequences for their distinctions in view of the categories of covertness and overtness, see Chatman (1978: 219; 196-197) Nünning/Nünning (2004), and Jahn (2005: N3.1.4).

119 Chatman (1978) also refers to the concept of covert narration as ‘effaced narration’ and argues that it is linked to direct and indirect discourse.
reflector modes. A good illustrative example of covert and overt narration will be studied in “The Giaour”, a poem whose narration at the beginning is covert and, therefore, neutrally transmitted, but gradually introduces a second level that is self-characterized in the manner of homodiegetic narration.

Narrative perspective can constitute one criterion for differentiating narrators. In the case of homodiegetic narration, narrators can also be distinguished according to whether they are the former self of the homodiegetic narrator (experiencing self) or the narrating self. In homodiegetic narration one needs to distinguish between the perspective and the identity of the narrating ‘I’ and that of the ‘experiencing ‘I’ - i.e., between the narrator-perspective of the instance narrating retrospectively and his/her former perspective as character in the fictional world. The main difference to be discerned is that between the former self, understood to mean the inexperienced protagonist- the experiencing ‘I’, and his or her older and wiser self- the narrating ‘I’. The past tense may be useful here.

Omniscient and omnipresent clues constitute the exclusive privileges of authorial narration and are important parameters for the differentiation between authorial narration, figural mode, and first-person narration. According to Nünning/Nünning (2004: 113), authorial narrators are often credited with ‘psychological privileges of insight into the internal processes of all characters’, including familiarity with their thoughts and feelings. They are accredited the temporal privilege that enables them to be able to survey the entire course of narrative events in the past, present and future, the ‘spatial privilege of invisible and fictive omnipresence, which includes presence in all places where characters are alone’, and can be as well in several locations simultaneously (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 113). The criterion of spatial privilege is the exclusive prerogative of the authorial narrator hardly emphasized in the figural and first-person narratorial manifestations. Narratologically acknowledged fundamental features of omnipresence and omniscience have been conceptualized in such references as psychoanalogies (metaphoric references) and perceptual indicators denoting a narrator’s level of insight into the internal processes of a character, and can also be used to mark a difference between the authorial narrator, the first-person homodiegetic narrator, and

---

120 In some of Byron’s narrative verse like “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” and others, the perception of the experiencing ‘I’ and that of the narrating ‘I’ can be combined to construct a homodiegetic text, allowing for fusion and ambiguity. This happens when the narrating ‘I’ features in the action as narrator and focalizer. O’Neill (1994: 88) refers to this kind of narration where the the narrator-focalizer is one and the same person as ‘embedded focalization’, a point he uses to challenge Chatman (1986) and Prince’s (2001) categorical denial that a narrator can focalize. See also Phelan’s (2001) discussion on why narrators can be focalizers.

the figural or reflector mode since reflector characters, like the first-person form, are narratologically denied the privilege of insight into other character’s minds.

The categories of mode, person\textsuperscript{122} and perspective proposed by Stanzel may constitute distinctive features of the three categories of narrators and seem to be an adequate answer to the problem of differentiation raised by this study. In Stanzel’s (1971) typology of structuring mediacy, the crucial elements of mode’, ‘person’, and ‘perspective’ can be divided into oppositions such as ‘narrator/reflector’, ‘first person/third person’, and ‘internal perspective/external perspective’. The three categories are important for my analysis of the differences that underlie first-person homodiegetic narration, third-person heterodiegetic authorial narration and the figural mode. The categories of mode, person and perspective constitute reliable criteria for distinction in the sense that in any given narrative situation each of the modes is emphasized. In the authorial narrative situation, the external perspective is emphasized, while in the first-person narrative situation the presence of the character in action is dominant. The figural narrative situation in both first- and third-person texts is identified by the dominance of the internal perspective and the reflector mode.

The categories of voice and perceptual clues function well as differential devices in focalization. Stanzel (1971: 6) proposes the categories of teller and reflector\textsuperscript{123} mode because ‘they usually present no problem when determining whether a personalized narrator (teller-character) or a figural medium (reflector-character) serves as the agent through which the narrated events reach the reader’.\textsuperscript{124} This terminological boundary shading that relies on the modes of story telling and viewing frames constitutes a suitable criterion for making distinctions with narrative communication and for differentiating narration from focalization. The distinctions take into consideration the fact that the narrator and focalizer perform

\textsuperscript{122} Cf. Allrath’s (2005) argument that, unlike vague traditional distinctions of narrative voice into first-person, second person and third person, Stanzel’s categories of person, mode and perspective possess analytical potentials since his mode, person and perspective provide categories of reference and hint at further implications of mediacy that each narrative situation might have.

\textsuperscript{123} Unlike Booth (1961: 153), who appears to restrict the figural medium to third-person texts - what he calls the third-person ‘centers of consciousness’ - Jahn (2005: N3.3.8) defines a reflector-mode narration as a narrative situation in which events or the story’s action is presented through the eyes of either a third-person or a first-person reflector character, also called internal focalizer. What makes Jahn’s definition more convincing is that he lets the reader see figural narration as a form that belongs to both first-person and third-person texts. Banfield (1982) refers to this agent as narratorless. See also Cohn’s (1978) emphasis that figural narration features in both first-person and third-person narration. Fludernik (1996) proposes internal focalization as a synonym for reflector-mode narration.

\textsuperscript{124} Cohn (1978) and Fludernik (1996) have provided distinctions similar to those of Stanzel. See Fludernik’s (1996: 345) theoretically grounded categorial distinctions of narrator and reflector based on the story telling frame as opposed to viewing frames by which the reflector reveals him/herself textually.
different roles. The narrator’s mode of manifestation is characterized by voice and report or telling, while in focalization, it is not the voice that is emphasized, but the feelings, perceptions, emotions, thoughts, and dreams in the character’s mind on which the story is based. The impression created is that in focalization as in the reflector mode, the reader has direct access into the internal processes of the character while in narration it is the voice of the narrator that is emphasized. This contrast can be explained further by the fact that, while first person and authorial narrators are tangible speakers with a distinct voice, ‘in figural narrative situations the narrator generally recedes into the background that traces of narrative transmission are barely noticeable’, in Nünning/Nünning’s (2004) words. In contradistinction, the narrated world in figural narrative situation is presented from the perspective of a character who is involved in the action as ‘reflector’, and functions as a medium or center of orientation with the results that his/her ‘perceptions and internal processes play a central role in determining what is being narrated […]’ Nünning/Nünning (2004: 113) In the opinion of the above narrative theorists, the implication is that the representation of subjective impressions, consciousness and internal processes of the reflector character takes the place of accounts of events or actions. The figural narrative situation gives the reader the impression of having direct insight into the perceiving, thinking, or feeling character, whereas the ‘authorial narrative situation features events presented from the external perspective of the superordinate narrator […]’. Still, in relation to the criterion of mode of textual manifestation, the interior monologue is characteristic of both the first-person and figural narrative situations in contrast to the authorial narrative situation where it is the external perspective that is emphasized. Consequently, certain narrative styles reduce the narrator’s role to that of telling, while those that point towards the presence of a reflector create the illusion that the textual agent on whose psychic processes the story is told does not narrate, but thinks, reflects, feels, dreams, imagines, and perceives in his or her consciousness. It is for this reason that the strategies by which the reader can differentiate between teller and reflector-character largely depends on the way a particular narrator or narrating agent constructs his or her narration. The criterion of mode is systematic and more helpful in reducing terminological confusions likely to result from distinctions based on person, scene and summary, to echo Stanzel. Consequently, mode may be productive for any attempt to distinguish narrative situations in the first person, the authorial narrative situation, and the figural narration since the first two

126 The view that the interior monologue is characteristic of first-person and a figural narrative situation is shared by Cohn (1978) and Jahn (2005).
construct their narration by verbalizing, while in the reflector mode, it is the internal processes including sensory impressions that are emphasized.

Stanzel (1971: 6-7) makes transparent the distinction within narrative levels based on telling and reflecting clues:

The teller-character’s main function is to tell, narrate, to communicate with the reader, to quote witnesses and, to comment on the story, to anticipate the outcome of an action or to recapitulate what has happened before the story opens […]. The reflector-character’s main function is to reflect, i.e., to mirror in his consciousness what is going on in the world outside or inside himself. A reflector never narrates in the sense of verbalizing his perceptions, thoughts, and feelings, since he does not attempt to communicate his perceptions and feelings to the reader.

Stanzel’s distinction between the reflector and the narrator based on strategies of telling and reflection implicit in the above excerpt also allows for clues by which the reader can tell ‘the difference between a story narrated by a teller-character and one presented through a reflector-character’ Stanzel (1971: 7). The impression created is that, when one encounters a narrator or even a teller-character, the mode of narration is voice or direct address to the narratee whereas the story presented through a reflector evades addressee strategies of mediation and adopts what is understood as scenic renderings, unmediated or immediacy of presentation in Stanzel’s (1971: 9) descriptions. While the first-person and the authorial narrative situations share analogous narrative techniques in the sense that ‘the reader is given the impression of being told a story by a clearly identifiable speaker’, whose narration is produced by means of the ‘storytelling frame’, the reflector mode¹²⁷ of the figural text, in contrast, manifests itself by means of reflection and other internal processes.

Similarly, when Lanser (1992: 4) argues that voice in narrative poetics can constitute a textual criterion for ‘designating tellers - as distinct from both authors and nonnarrating characters - of narrative’, what she appears to imply is that voice is the distinguishing marker of a narrator in contrast to the ‘cognitive frames of seeing, perceiving or experiencing’ which ‘represent the true hallmark of the reflector mode that is so characteristic of the figural

---

¹²⁷ See Nünning/Nünning (2004: 114). For more on the figural medium and its forms of textual manifestation, see Jahn (2005: N3.3.8; N3.3.9; N3.3.10.), also Booth’s (1961) ‘camera eyes’, ‘mirrors’, or ‘scene’ (showing) and ‘summary’ (often understood to mean telling). Booth, however, challenges such distinctions as imprecise unless specifications are made as to the kind of narrator in the scene or the summary. See also Lothe’s (2000) elaboration on this mode of narration. By attributing to this mode of narration, not actions of characters directly dramatized, but rather the ‘the mental record of everything that happen’ (Booth 1961: 163), ‘reflectorization’, ‘viewing’, ‘perceiving’, and ‘experiencing’ become differential and analytical markers that signal the reflector-mode as distinct from the narrator who tells stories or constructs meaning verbally, and who manifests textually through physical actions.
narrative situation'. Stanzel’s suggestion that mode or voice and reflector signals can mark off the teller from the reflector is relevant for this study. One may infer that there is a transparent relationship between, on the one hand, viewer and reflector and, on the other hand, teller and voice, (teller, here meaning someone speaking, or narrating a story to an addressee.) If voice is equated with tellers, then a textual agent that who exists only in mental forms will be distinguished by the same features. Seen as such, story telling frames and viewing frames will function in this study as useful criteria to mark first-person and authorial narrators as distinct from reflector characters. In other words, the criterion of voice is useful as it enables the reader to distinguish certain types of narrative situations that use voice (authorial heterodiegetic, first-person narrating voice, and personal voice) from those that are only made manifest in mental forms. The example of a text in “The Corsair” in which Conrad, the reflector character, is seen in lonely cell thinking about his predicament would serve to illustrate salient differences between story telling frames and viewing frames. Despite the fact that the criteria of viewing and storytelling frames can prove their merit as differential devices in the main narrative situations identified above, they become inadequate, however, when issues specific to simultaneous narration and mind forms that cannot be covered by consciousness modes such as emotions, behavior, attitudes and dispositions are raised. Notice that some first-person narrators appear as reflectors as the case of the

129 For more on voice as a relevant criterion in distinguishing narrators from nonnarrating characters in Lanser’s (1992) description, see Genette (1980) and even some structuralist narratologists - for example Richard Aczel (1998), Hühn and Schönert (2005), Jahn (2005) etc. In conceptualizing voice as ‘who speaks?’, the impression is that in classical narratology, voice is a restricted term designating tellers as distinct from non-narrating characters of narrative (Lanser 1992: 3) also called focalizers.
130 Cf. Nünning/Nünning’s opinion (2004: 115) that diverse hybrid forms exist between the authorial and figural narrative situations, whereas examples of combinations of the first-person and the authorial narrative situations arerarer. To be able to identify such hybrid forms in narrative text, one needs to take into consideration ‘the extent to which the narrator appears as speaker, as well as according to whether the external or internal perspective dominates in the presentation of the characters’. The third-person narrators of “The Corsair” and “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” contain features of a reflector mode as they often attempt to enter the character’s minds and reveal to the reader the character’s thoughts and reflections.
131 Palmer (2002: 28-47) discusses the problems likely to result from speech categories of classical narratology and also in thought or consciousness forms provided by Cohn (1978). He notes that the speech category approach of classical narratology does not provide an adequate account of either the forms or the functions of narratological categories for the constructions of character’s minds by narrators and readers since there is a part of the mind that is not inner speech. Noting that categories such as direct thought and free indirect thought tend to account only for part of the character’s mind that is highly verbalized and self-conscious, a flow of consciousness known as inner speech’, he regrets the ‘resulting neglect of the thought report of the character’s states of mind’. Palmer makes the point clear that ‘states of mind’ should be understood as the label for those areas of characters’ minds that are not inner speech. The examples he gives include mood, desires, emotions, sensations, visual images, attention, memory, states of dispositions (he was prone to depression), beliefs, judgements, skills, knowledge, imagination, intellect, volition, character traits, habits of
category called the ‘experiencing I’\textsuperscript{132} that features in Byron’s “Childe Harold Pilgrimage” III. Such an argument indicates my intention to anchor further innovative differential categories of perception and voice in order to provide the reader with narrative forms that can be instrumental in making specifications in narrative communication.

What is particularly important about Stanzel’s model is that the distinction between the narrator-focalizer and the character-focalizer as well as that between the teller and reflector can be drawn following the criteria of person, perspective and mode. The external perspective dominates in authorial narration. The reflector mode (internal perspective or internal focalization) characterizes the figural mode while the first person dominates in the first person (Cohn 1981: 160). Furthermore, Stanzel’s distinction between the narrator and figural characters in such conceptual references as teller/reflector\textsuperscript{133} not only provide a systematic criterion for distinctions, but offer clear insight into certain levels of narrative communication hitherto unemphasized in poetry criticism. It may be important to point out that the dominant features that constitute each of the narrative situations analyzed by Stanzel can allow the study to mark out distinctions in the three narrator types: the authorial, whose voice we hear in the third-person with an external perspective as the narrator; the figural, realized in the third-person reflector, with internal perspective; the interior monologue typical of the first-person reflector; and the first person with internal perspective. Of relevance to this work is the reflector mode which is found in third-person and first-person internal focalizers, a distinction inconceivable in Hühn’s transgeneric narratology of poetry criticism. Its absence from certain first-person forms like the first-person (homodiegetic) narrating ‘I’ allows for an assumption that the reflector mode is a distinction that separates authorial narration from first-person narration.

Another relevant criterion for making specifications and for the analysis of narrators within a text, which is productive for the interpretation of the poems chosen for analysis, is thoughts, intentions, purposes, motives, reasons for action (31), and behavior such as laughter and feelings (37).

\textsuperscript{132} For more on the use of the experiencing ‘I’ in first person narrative texts, see Chatman and Jahn (2005: N3; 3.8). My subsequent discussion of the uses of figural narrative mood in poetry analysis will, in addition to others discussed under mental categories, follow the above theoretically oriented linguistic parameters but will insist on their functionality as analytical devices.

\textsuperscript{133} Cf. Stanzel’s (1971: 6) argument that the two contradictory modes of teller and reflector correspond to conceptualism (telling) and impressionism (showing).
the degree of their reliability\textsuperscript{134}, credibility or trustworthiness. Reliability can mark narration in the third-person as opposed to narration in the first-person, which is often considered as unreliable. The pronominal ‘I’ marks the beginning of any attempt to differentiate first-person and authorial heterodiegetic narrators based on the criterion of (un)reliability. According to Meindl, (2004: 68):

\begin{quote}
[f]irst-person narrative manifests quantitative limitation, or limitation in scope: the narrator cannot simply state the inner world (thoughts, feelings, etc.) of others. Third-person narrative does this regularly, and it is thus marked by quantitative unlimitedness. […] Due precisely to the fact that its agency is not a person or subject, third-person narrative has authority; that is, it can scarcely be subjective or unreliable, but is basically reliable in the sense of being authorial […].
\end{quote}

Such an argument implies that the grammatical ‘I’ is a subjective signal. It can be considered a marker of unreliability and, therefore a criterion for separating third person from first-person narrated texts. In contrast, external narrators are never part of the narrated world and are narratologically attributed complete authority, omniscience and objectivity.\textsuperscript{135} This is because, unlike the characters in the fictional world, the authorial narrator can follow characters everywhere there is action, and can move between past, present and feature. Since an external narrator is often accredited with cognitive and spatial privileges that allow him/her access into the minds of story characters and permit him/her to be present everywhere simultaneously, including the ability to see into the past, present and future, ‘he will never forget, never be confused or in error, never lie, and never twist his or her narrative to suit his own ends […]’. (O’Neill 1994: 62) What this explanation leads the reader to see is the fact that the vision of an external narrator is physically and cognitively unrestricted, a reason for which they are most likely to be considered reliable and different from character-narrators who inhabit the fictional world and cannot see beyond their physical and cognitive limits. Unreliability signals can therefore be used to mark first person narrators as distinct from authorial narrators.

The techniques used to represent consciousness and mental processes in general are important for making categorical distinctions in any given narrative and will be deployed in this study to distinguish reflectors from teller characters. Since the “way in which the ‘inner

\textsuperscript{134}For this differentiation, see Nünning/Nünning (2004: 120-121). For more discussion of the criterion of (un)reliability, kinds and signs of manifestations, see O’Neil (1994: 61-66). For a challenge to Booth’s criterion of (un)reliability, see O’Neil (1994).

\textsuperscript{135}An exception to the rule is the homodiegetic narrating ‘I’. For more discussion on the physical and cognitive limitations of homodiegetic narrators, see Chatman (1986). See also Prince’s (2001) related discussion on why narrators can never be focalizers.
world’ is represented differs from one narrative situation to the next”\(^{136}\), narrators need to be differentiated to guide an understanding of their peculiarities, forms of textual manifestations and functions they may allow. Narrative concepts have been proposed for differentiating between modes for presenting consciousness ‘based on the degree to which the narrator appears as a mediator within the text’.\(^ {137}\) Since narrative forms such as ‘psychonarration’, ‘free indirect discourse’ (Cohn’s narrated monologue) and ‘interior monologue’ (also conceptualized by Cohn as quoted monologue) occur frequently in Byron’s narrative poetry, and considering their uses for my analysis of the role consciousness representation strategies play in the analysis and differentiation of narration from focalization, they need to be differentiated here.\(^ {138}\) According to Nünning/Nünning (2004: 125), ‘psycho-narration’ describes a mode of representing mental processes characterized by a relatively high degree of narratorial participation. The above narratologists agree that as in the case of free indirect discourse, the linguistic criteria are the use of pronouns for the third-person and past tense. In contrasting psychonarration and free indirect discourse, they point out that in psychonarration the narrator uses his or her own language (rather than the language of the character) to summarize a character’s state of mind. The distinction between ‘free indirect discourse’ or ‘narrated monologue’ and psychonarration (eventhough they have similarities at the level of form) is that free indirect discourse attempts to convey the illusion of offering an immediate insight into the perceptions and internal processes of a character. (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 125). Typical markers for free indirect discourse provided by the above narrative critics are loose syntax and including questions, exclamations and signals of subjectivity. In free indirect discourse, however, the character’s thoughts and feelings are generally rendered in their own language. Adopting Nünning/Nünning (2004: 125) still, the term ‘interior monologue’ or ‘quoted monologue’ refers to a highly mimetic form of presenting consciousness in which the thoughts and feelings of a character are ‘quoted’ without any discernible mediating instance. These monologues can create the impression of complete immediacy in the way they render

\(^{136}\) Cf. Nünning/Nünning (2004: 124). These narratologies further provide an illuminating discussion of consciousness that may be important for any attempt to differentiate between categories of representing consciousness. Their argument is that, while in the first–person narrative situation, the presentation of internal processes is typically subject to certain restrictions due to the narrator’s participation in the world of characters; these restrictions do not apply to the authorial and figural narrative situation. Authorial narrators have access to the internal processes of all characters, and frequently analyse and comment on their thoughts rather than merely presenting those thoughts (124).


\(^{138}\) For the illuminating discussion on differentiations between narrative modes for presenting consciousness which I adopt here, see Nünning /Nünning (2004: 125).
internal processes. ‘In contrast to psychonarration and free indirect discourse, the interior monologue, [...] makes extensive use of the first-person singular and the present tense’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 125). Byron’s narrative poetry written in the first person-narrative situation also constructs consciousness strategies. Like in third-person texts, consciousness modes in first-person texts are many. The above strategies will be used in the study to account for the differences between narrators and reflectors, and between the different narrators identified for analysis.

The narrative modes suitable for analyzing consciousness in first-person texts such as retrospective narrative styles, simultaneous narration, and monologues will be useful in the study because they can perform discriminative and analytical functions. Two distinct modes of narration are provided in Cohn’s (1978) insightful work on narrative modes for presenting consciousness in texts. The difference often noticeable in homodiegetically narrated texts is basically that between the narrating self and the experiencing self of the reflector character. The distinction to be made here is that between the narrating self and the experiencing self, which is quite visible in homodiegetic narration. First-person texts reveal different forms of textual manifestations and include such techniques as dissonant self-narration, consonant self-narration, self-quoted monologue, and self-narrated monologue. Here, the first–person narrator’s relationship to their past self (which Cohn compares to the third-narrator’s relationship to their protagonists in a third-persons narrative) is a reason to consider the differences that underlie cognitive styles in first person texts. One form which narratology refers to as the narrating ‘I’ is also used to refer to the more mature, enlightened, knowing and wiser narrator. In contrast to the narrating ‘I’, there is the experiencing ‘I’, which narratologists including Cohn (1978), McHale (1981), and Hühn (2004), amongst others, regard as the past perspective or self of the narrating ‘I’, (a young and immature protagonist). The distinction between the narrating ‘I’ and the experiencing ‘I’ is that between the narrator who is the same person with the self he describes in the story, and the narrator who is a different person from the self described although his two selves remain yoked by the first-person pronoun. In homodiegetic narration, when the narrator is the same person as the self described in the story, the mode of narration is called consonant self-narration.139 In contrast, 139 For this explanation see Cohn (1978: 144).
140 Cohn’s (1978: 154; 155) terminology is understood to mean that the narrator identifies with his/her past self, minimising all indications of cognitive previledge. Self-quoted monologue (Cohn 1978: 162), mostly found in modern autobiographical texts, is understood to mean occassional quotations of thoughts in the manner ‘I said to myself’ and are distinguished by quotation marks that mark off monologue from narration, or the
when the narrator is a different self from the experiencing self, the difference is noticed in memory devices or the retrospective mental forms of narration - what Cohn (1978) refers to as dissonant self-narrative styles. Having analyzed strategies which are most relevant for my discussion of the differences between agents and levels of mediation in the scope of this study, the following section will provide narrative categories and strategies within transgeneric narratology that may be fruitful for any analysis of narration.

2.3 Strategies of Interpretation and Analysis in the Authorial Narrative Situation

Narratological concepts provided for the representation and analysis of authorial narration often focus on fundamental analytical categories or strategies such as explicit and covert markers, third-person references, tense clues, metannarrative commentaries, narratee strategies, features that point towards the dominance of the external perspective, reliability\(^{141}\) markers, forms that may signal unlimited spatial and cognitive authority and privileges of authorial narrator, perspective, mental and extra-representational clues as well as grammatical or linguistic elements. These and others would constitute the criteria by which authorial narration can be identified and analyzed in Byron’s narrative poetry. Since they are the very means by which ideology or given cultures can be represented in Byron’s narrative texts, they constitute enhancing indicators of the link that transgeneric narratology shares with cultures. The first group of markers for analysing authorial narration is those that can be described as linguistic.

Both personalized (overt) and covert references are important for any analysis of an authorial text since these constitute enhancing indicators that narration is controlled by an external narrator. Jahn (2005: N3.1.5) argues that ‘a text is heterodiegetic if all story-related action sentences are in the third-person’. This serves to corroborate my argument that an authorially narrated text would be identified by references in the third-person such as ‘he’ and ‘she’. This implies that third-person references, whether intrusive or impersonal, would trigger an interpretation of a text as authorial. Poems like “Don Juan” and “The Corsair” are written in the third-person and would constitute my examples of how an authorial narrator’s past thoughts from his present thoughts. The device is also relevant though not emphasized in Byron’s poetry.

\(^{141}\) See Nünning /Nünning (2004: 122) for this emphasis.
manifests him/herself textually, distinguishes him/herself from narration in the first-person form, as well as perform narrative and context related functions in analysis.

Any analysis of authorial narration needs to consider the role of extra-representational devices for establishing the narrator’s perspective and for his interpretation in general. As we pointed out above, not all authorial narrators identify themselves by means of self-references since some feature as covert speakers at times. In the absence of self-references, therefore, extra-representational features may certainly have consequences for our interpretation of a poetic text as authorial (heterodiegetic), and may ‘allow conclusive statements about the functions of a given text’.

Textual elements such as descriptions of settings, identification of characters, temporal summaries, definition of characters, reports of what the characters think, do not think; or say, interpretation, reflections, judgements, generalizations about the world ‘beyond’ the fiction, direct addresses to the narratee, comments on the narrative process and allusions to other writers and texts (Lanser 1992: 15-17) would constitute further textual elements by which an authorial narrator’s identity or visibility and also perspective can be analyzed to yield certain functions. These extra-representational acts will allow the study to construct narratorial voice and perspective. The question of how extra-representational acts may represent fictional voice and the perspective of an authorial narrator is linked to that of how narration can construct contexts since both literary history and cultural contexts enter a narrative by means of the same forms of constructing an authorial narrator. In the case of this study, it is precisely the question of how extra-representational elements and narrative forms can permit the reader to construct contexts and narrative situations (the romantic and narrative fictive traditions). In addition, extra-representational acts may allow the consideration of thematic issues, values, and narrative conventions in the discussion of narration in poetry and in the construction of literary history in general.

The notion of perspective, from Ansgar Nüning’s (2001: 218) point of view, is linked to the role of cognitive factors that deal with private domains of fictional agents and may provide narrative clues that can be useful in the construction and interpretation of character-perspective and narrator-perspective in narrative texts. Given that the notion of perspective itself is one of the central issues discussed by narratology and cultural narratology, the reader needs to consider the category of perspective structure as one way

142 For the use of the phrase, see Allrath (2005: 122).
characters and narrators enter Byrons’ texts. Any analysis of a narrative text as authorial (heterodiegetic) thus necessitates a reliance on such a concept as perspective structure (which can also be explained with reference to first-person narrative). Allrath’s opinion (2005: 32) that only narrator’s who engage in what Lanser (1992: 16) subsumes under the heading ‘extra-representational acts’ become ‘visible’ and ‘tangible’ for the reader is important for an understanding of the role of extra-representational features in the construction of the narrator-perspective. Since narrator-perspective constitutes a hierarchy of perspectives including the character’s that it embeds, and since the narrator’s ‘set of preconditions, comprising his or her (fictional) biographical background, psychological and physical disposition, norms and values, knowledge and abilities, level of information, intentions, wishes, obligations [and] expectations’144 will influence an interpretation of the narrative poem as authorial, the cognitive devices that may signalize the private domain of a narrator may also aid the reader to assign perspective and thus textual identity and functions to a fictional agent.

Perspective structure can be constructed in authorial narrative texts that construct heterodiegetic and overt or personalized narrators, to borrow Ansgar Nünning’s phrase (2001: 219). In the textual world of the authorial heterodiegetic personalized narrator, two perspectives can be distinguished: the narrator-perspective and the character-perspectives. Since authorial narrators follow characters everywhere there is action (mental and physical), ‘functioning as a controlling, coordinating, and integrating instance’, and seeking to know what the characters ‘think, feel, […] know, or do not know’ 145, the character-perspectives are often embedded in the narrator-perspective. In addition, such instances where the authorial heterodiegetic narrator comments on the cognitive restrictions that underlie human subjectivity may constitute ways by which the narrator evaluates the character-perspectives. The cognitive strategies by which character-perspective and narrator-perspective may be created or analyzed may serve as the very means by which the reader can construct a particular narrative situation. Typical examples of the forms and functions that these narrative instances may allow for will be provided when we turn to the analysis of poems like “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage”, “Don Juan”, “The Giaour” and others. Ansgar Nünning’s methodology of perspective structure can be a basis for determining the role narrative poems play in providing narrative features for constructing both narrative situation and contexts. From this

144 Cf. Allrath (2005: 23). Notice also Allrath’s remark that covert narrators do not justify the idea that the story is narrated by a human-like agent.

145 See Ansgar Nünning (2001: 220) for this concept.
assumption, the various ways of constructing perspectives will demonstrate the relevance of narration for constructing cultural discourses in the same way as they are productive for the writing of literary history.\textsuperscript{146}

The need to include a pragmatic signal like the narratee\textsuperscript{147} understood by Allrath (2005: 30) to mean a textually inscribed receiver of the narrative or the narrator’s message, in the transgeneric narratological parameters for the analysis of narratorial voice cannot be overlooked considering the significance of the concept for analyzing narration in any given poetic text. Pragmatic signals constitute parameters that may signal the narrator’s awareness of an audience and the degree of his or her orientation towards it.\textsuperscript{148} One such signal is the narratee, a narratological construct who functions as the receiver of the narrator’s message in narrative communication. In the light of Genette’s (1980: 29) opinion, Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 89) argues that ‘the narratee is the agent who is at the very least implicitly addressed by the narrator’. The impression conveyed by such a statement is that the narratee is significant for an understanding of how an authorial narrator enters a given narrative text since first-person narrators are often in the story and do not have contact with the external world. The presence of the narratee is apt to signal the presence of the speaker who introduces him/her into the text. The need to consider the narratee as a typical voice marker is thus linked to how overt authorial narrators enter the narrative texts since only such narrators can address the reader.\textsuperscript{149}

In other words, reader-address categories will help the study to identify authorial third-person heterodiegetic narrators in a text since there can be no reader or addressee without a narrator who brings him/her into the text.\textsuperscript{150} The link between reader-address strategies such as

\textsuperscript{146} The term has been used by Ansgar Nünning (2000: 364) in a similar context. For more on areas of narrative interest that can be explored by means of the framework provided by character and narrator-perspectives, consult Ansgar Nünning (2001: 223).

\textsuperscript{147} Allrath (2005: 29-35) provides an elaborate and relevant discussion of the role of the narratee as a textual strategy. Even though his emphasis is on the significance of the gendered narratee for a conception of the role gender plays in narrative communication, his analysis of the narratee’s perception is important for my interpretation of the narrator who is often held responsible for bringing the latter into the text. Allrath (30) also provides a useful distinction between the narratee and such concepts as the implied, intended, virtual, or ideal reader, when she argues that the narratee, in contrast to the former is a purely textual phenomenon.

\textsuperscript{148} See Jahn (2005: N1.3.) for this relevant definition.

\textsuperscript{149} As Allrath (2005: 30) convincingly argues, the reader needs to be reminded that longer narrative texts such as novels and narrative poems can have several narratees who fulfill the role of the narrator’s addressee either subsequently or simultaneously with the possibility that a group can occupy the position of a narratee.

\textsuperscript{150} A variety of reader-response theoretical orientations that operate to represent the different types of readers a text can construct have been investigated in New Criticism, structuralism, Psychoanalysis, and deconstruction, as outlined by Tompkins (1980: xi). These range from narratee, to implied reader, to implied audience etc. For more on types of readers a narrative text can construct and their definitions see Prince (1980; 1987).
Narratee and narration is that they may constitute strategies put in a textual fragment by the narrator to make his/her presence known. Consequently, the presence of addressee signals including the most prominent ‘you’ can constitute an explicit indication of the narrator’s language, and therefore the narrator him/herself151.

Since a narratee, like narrators can either be extradiegetic or intradiegetic (Allrath 2005: 30), the clues by which they are identified need to be specified. In the case of an intradiegetic narrator there is, correspondingly, an intradiegetic fictional narratee who is part of the fictional world while the extradiegetic (heterodiegetic) narrator tells his story to the addressee who, like the narrator, remains outside the fictional world.152 The narratee’s degree of perceptibility is a determining factor in the identification of the narrator’s presence and role in narrative communication. What Allrath (2005: 31-32) calls an ‘implicit’ narratee is a narratee whose presence is not discernible. Adopting Allrath’s opinion still, an individualized or personalized interlocutor refers to the overt narratee who is addressed by the narrator either through the use of second-person pronouns (or even a name) or by referring to an entity designated as reader in the third-person. What the analysis may suggest is that the forms by which a given narratee appears in narrative communication is also an indelible marking of the presence of the narrator who is controlling the narrative.

Quoting Simpson, Toolan (2001 [1988]: 70) states that linguistic categories may be helpful in determining the type of narratorial voice a given text constructs. Grammatical categories such as verbs that would suggest unlimited authority and cognition will be used to reveal certain ways by which authorial narration features in a poem like “Don Juan” and others.

Further narrative means that would direct the reader’s attention to the presence of an authorial narrator constitute mental verbs or vocabulary in general that may signal the presence of an external perspective. This implies that the forms by which authorial (heterodiegetic) narration enters a narrative text, and which are important for his/her identification, interpretation and analysis, cannot be restricted to grammatical features that Toolan (2001 [1998]: 70) has cited. Notice that mental phenomena constitute inescapable hallmarks for any analysis of how narration in third-person and first-person texts link texts to narrative and contexts. Authorial narrators like first-person and figural modes also make

151 Cf. Jahn’s (2005: N1.6) warning that care must be taken not to confuse the fictional addressee (the text’s ‘you’) with ourselves, the real readers.
themselves perceptible in narrative texts by means of mental and consciousness representation strategies. I am referring, first, to Cohn’s (1978) categories that are apt to delineate a narrative situation as authorial owing to its psychological privileges. This is what McHale (1981: 187) refers to as ‘extramental world’ of the characters especially when the narrating instance is accredited with insight into both the inner world of characters and those areas of the mind that cannot be accounted for by speech categories and consciousness modes.153

In view of the above argument, the question how an authorial narrative voice can be constructed by means of privileges ranging from omniscience to omnipresence154 hardly emphasized in the first-person and figural narrative situations can be answered by relying on narrative means for representing mental processes of characters. Since authorial narrators are often accredited cognitive privileges of omniscience and omnipresence, they can enter the minds of characters or see into the inner life of characters and interpret their mental states in general. This would imply that the narrative means by which ‘the whole minds of fictional characters in action’155 enter the text are relevant for constructing authorial narration. Some of the privileges of authorial narration that also serve to determine their presence in a text include: first, the psychological privileges of insight into the internal processes of all characters and familiarity with their thoughts and feelings; second, the spatial privilege of invisible and fictive omnipresence, which include presence in all places where characters are alone as well as the presence in several locations simultaneously; and, last but not the least, the temporal privilege of being able to survey the entire course of narrative events in the past, present and future.156 I therefore propose to introduce Palmer (2002) and Cohn’s (1978) categories for representing consciousness in third-person authorial texts to serve as further

153 McHale (1981: 187) and also Palmer (2002: 32) challenged thought approach developed by Cohn (1978) and others on grounds that they tend to exclude other areas of the mind that cannot be covered by consciousness representation categories. We shall pay attention to this debate soon.

154 Cohn (1978: 11) notes, ‘omniscience’ is too general in the respect that anything, not only the psyche, can be described ‘omnisciently’. I therefore use the terms omniscience and omnipresence to include physical and psychological privileges often ascribed to authorial narrators. Considering the fact that the terms may be misleading, we will employ consciousness representation categories in third person texts proposed by Cohn (1978) and also those provided by Pascal (1977), Palmer (2002) and others for clarification.

155 I do not intend the phrase ‘fictional minds in action’ to imply narrative modes for rendering thought or consciousness in fiction provided in different narrative contexts by Roy Pascal (1977), Genette (1980), Chatman (1986), Cohn (1978), Fludernik (1992) etc., which cover focalization, free indirect discourse, interior monologues, reflectorization, stream of consciousness and more. In addition to these narrative features, I use the phrase in the general sense to include ‘part of the mind that is not inner speech’ (Palmer 2002: 30) to allow an inclusion of mental phenomena such as emotions, mood, images, memory and sensations into the study of narrators.

156 Cf. Nünning /Nünning (2004: 113) for the following analysis.
narratological categories for interpreting authorial heterodiegetic narrators and for constructing their functions.

Still in line with the argument that mental phenomena can encourage an interpretation of a text as authorial, any textual clue that suggests the narrator’s knowledge of a character’s ‘states of mind’ can be an important criterion for constructing authorial narration in poetry. The impression that another person’s mind can be experienced can also mean that the narrator can see and reports what happens in the minds of fictional characters. Palmer’s (2002: 31) strategies for analyzing ‘states of mind’ can be important for the analysis of a text as authorial. Examples of such elements drawn from Palmer’s theory of the mind that may be relevant for my discussion are mood, desires, sensations, emotions, visual images, attention, memory; those that express a character’s states of dispositions, believes, attitudes, judgements, skills, knowledge, imagination, intellect, character traits, habits of thoughts, intentions, purposes, motives, reasons for action, and behavior such as laughter etc. While passages from narrative poems including “Don Juan”, “The Giaour” etc. will illustrate the use of mind forms in narration, they would constitute illustrative instances of how the authorial narrator’s identity can be discerned, analyzed or differentiated from that of first-person narrators whose spatial limitations restrict their functions.

Consciousness representation strategies (see Cohn 1978) are elements of Byron’s narrative poetry and may constitute determining factors in the way an authorial narrator enters the narrative text and allow for certain functions ranging from a construction of narrative situations to locating a text within a specific literary culture. We propose to start our discussion here with the category of psychonarration. In an attempt to construct authorial narration by means of psychonarration, readers may rely on the way a text renders ‘in a narrator’s knowing words, what a character ‘knows’. In this respect, a narrator can report or interpret the character’s inner states in his own language rather than that of the character as it is the case of free indirect discourse. This implies that an authorial narrator may report what the character is doing or may talk about a character’s inner feelings by means of psychonarration. Since authorial narrators generally have unrestricted access to the internal processes of all characters and frequently analyze and comment on their thoughts, (Nünning

157 Palmer (2002: 31) provides an elaborate discussion on mind forms that are both extra-mental and that can be reached by means of psychonarration.

158 For the definition of the concept of psychonarration, see Cohn (1978: 46) and also Nünning /Nünning (2004: 123).
psychonarration, which describes a mode of presenting a character’s inner life in the narrator’s words becomes one form of interpreting a text as authorial. The linguistic criteria that would create the illusion that a text contains features of psychonarration or reveal the narrator’s knowledge of the character’s inner life which are vital for any interpretation of a text as authorial would include the use of pronouns for the third-person singular and the past tense.

In attempting to interpret authorial narration by means of psychonarration, one can also rely on psychoanalogies as suggested by Cohn (1978: 41-45). Psychoanalogies enter the text by means of imagistic associations. Similes and metaphors are often textual indicators of psychoanalogies, and constitute narrative means of rendering consciousness of characters. The act of making imagistic associations is a mental activity and not a physical event. Since such a psychic activity takes place in the mind of a character, the technique of psychoanalysis not only draws attention to the character who imagines, but also raises the question of the identity of the agent from whom the language and information about characters’ thoughts emerges. This implies that imagistic association is a way of accounting for the narrator’s textual identity. My argument here is that behind any imagistic association of things, there is a thinker, perceiver and also a voice that sees the thinker, interprets the event, and attempts to convey it in language and images. The technique of psychoanalysis should not only be understood as a textual indicator for the reflector character. The reader can only have access to the dreaming or imagining character’s mind, feelings, or emotions through the voice of the agent who has access to mental processes. The point I am making is that issues of similes and metaphors, including certain inner experiences such as feelings, emotions, sensations, visions and dreams are particularly suited for the analysis of authorial narration in poetic texts. The technique of psychoanalysis can provide important grounds for the construction of authorial narrative situations in Byron’s poetry.

One can also encounter an authorial narration in poetry through the device of ‘metanarrative expressions’. The question of which precise elements can serve as textual indicators for the device of metanarration needs to be given particular attention. Such an attempt may allow for the identification and analysis of the uses of metanarrative devices

---

159 For the use of the phrase, see Cohn (1978: 48).
160 Ansgar Nünning (2004a) proposes a typology and poetics of metanarration; and paying attention to different understandings, definitions, and uses of the term, he elaborately provides typological differentiations and functional implications of metanarrative comments in British novels from the end of the 17th century to the present.
evident in some of Byron’s narrative poetry, and the functions that can be constructed as a consequence. ¹⁶¹ Notwithstanding the typological¹⁶² scope of metanarrative clues in narrative theory, my discussion draws on Ansgar Nünning’s (2004a) categories of metanarrative commentary. My analysis is also restricted to those metanarrative comments that pertain to narration, create the impression of a personified voice and that of a speaker or narrator (Ansgar Nünning 2004: 17a). Metanarrative comments, metafiction, and metalinguistic comments would constitute important clues for a narrative voice which transmits the ‘events and existents’ (Chatman 1978: 19) or organizes and structures narration. Metannarative comments may therefore allow for an identification of authorial narratorial voice as well as enable the construction of certain narratorial functions in the poetry of Byron. In reference to Ansgar Nünning’s precise categorical criteria for distinctions, I will draw on formal evidence as a starting point for my analysis of the uses of metanarrative comments in constructing narration.¹⁶³

With regards to formal criteria, a reader can link metanarrative expressions to authorial voice. The relevant question of what kind of textual speaker self-consciously discusses the process of narration and on which level of communication this discussion can be situated (Ansgar Nünning 2004a: 22) needs to be considered here. According to this criterion which specifically takes level into consideration, a difference needs to be established between the extradiegetic and the diegetic forms of metanarration. In the first case, one or more character(s) of the narrated world reflect(s) on the process of narration. In the second instance, metanarrative expressions are restricted to the narrator who discusses narrative issues on a higher communication level (Ansgar Nünning 2004a: 22). It is according to this criterion that theoretically available levels of metanarration such as frame narratives, and hypodiegetic

¹⁶¹ I am not aware of any study that has discussed the forms and uses of metanarrative devices as voice clues in Byron’s narrative poetry.

¹⁶² Problems regarding metanarration range from terminological, typological to the definitional ones, including ‘functional differences’ (Ansgar Nünning 2004a: 48) and need to be addressed here. ‘Metafiction’ has many names and is used differently by critics (sometimes subsumed under ‘metanarration’, ‘metanarrative’ (Genette’s term for narrative embedding). These terms need to be specified. Although metanarration and metafiction intersect in their common emphasis on self-referentiality, a basic theoretical distinction is made between metanarration, and other forms of self-reflexive narration, according to Ansgar Nünning. Adopting his emphasis (2004a: 18), I use metanarration in this study to refer to those comments detached from the narrated world (story level), and to specific forms of self-reflexive narration in which aspects of narration (and not fictionality of the narrated world often attributed to metafiction) become the subject of narratorial discourse. This implies that I will pay attention to metanarrative interpolations which have narrative functions.

¹⁶³ Formal distinctions attempt to draw a line between the diegetic, extradiegetic, and paratextual types of metanarration (which I am not concerned with here). For other types of metanarration including the structural and the content forms, see Ansgar Nünning (2004a/b).
narratives can be useful to describe extradiegetic narration more specifically. These two categories of metanarration are dominant in “The Giaour” and also “Don Juan”, which is for the greater part narrated in authorial style. In addition, metanarration also occurs on the diegetic level of communication. Among those to be discussed under this category are the ‘interpolated tales’ or ‘embedded stories’ that occur mostly when characters tell their life stories in the form of interpolated tales.

Metalinguistic forms also constitute further types of metanarrative phenomena and need to be identified and differentiated considering their relevance for my analysis of narration in the poetry of Byron. Metalinguistic criteria focus on the differences between the metaphoric and non-metaphoric forms of metanarration. Since narrators often construct their narration by means of psychoanalogies (Cohn 1978), the narrative fragments which make clear that the narrator conveys his own narrative in imagistic patterns may constitute one linguistic form by which an authorial voice is identified.

The devices above may not be exhaustive, but they may yet be important for the ways a reader can identify a text as authorial narration. The same forms may be crucial for analyzing the functions of authorial narration in the interpretation and construction of meaning in narrative texts in general and in this study in particular. The factors analyzed above as indicators for authorial narration may occur in other narrative situations in the first-person and the figural mode. Finally, the reader needs to be reminded that the above markers are important for constructing authorial voice and issues of contexts specific to this study including the Romantic literary culture and the narrative tradition prevalent in the 20th-century modern novel. In the context of this study, the link between narratology and cultural narratology, which considers narrative itself as crucial, can be established by making recourse to the above narrative devices.

2.4 Strategies of Reference and Analysis in First-Person Homodiegetic Narrative Texts

To answer one of the study’s crucial questions of how a first-person narrator can be identified and analyzed in order to shed light on his/her functions, one needs to consider the following devices. To answer the question of who a given speaker is in any first-person narrated text, personalized references in the first-person singular and the ‘we’ form need to be considered.

---

164 Within these criteria, Ansgar Nünning also discusses the category called paratextual forms of metanarration.
165 See Ansgar Nünning (2004a: 23); see also Jahn (2005).
Jahn’s (2005) insightful statement that a text is homodiegetic if there are first-person pronouns amongst its story\textsuperscript{166} action sentences already indicates the importance of personalized devices in the analysis of first-person texts. Jahn’s emphasis on the fact that first-person narrators are located in the fictional world by means of action-oriented sentences is narratologically grounded and has relevance for any attempt to identify first-person narrators. Although the authorial narrator has similar forms of manifestations as the overt ones reveal themselves in the ‘I’ linguistic signal, the difference to be noted is that authorial narrators are never identified in the fictional world or in action-sentences as first-person narrators. I am drawing the reader’s attention to the fact that first-person texts with personalized references such as ‘I’ or ‘we’ in the singular would create the impression that the narrator is homodiegetic or autodiegetic.

In my earlier analysis I discussed theoretical grounds on which narrators can be distinguished based on the criterion of (un)reliability. We now focus briefly on signals for unreliable narration that may mark a text as first-person. In the earlier analysis, we attempted to draw attention to the fact that ‘I’ could be a relevant signal for the narrator’s unreliability. Hühn (2004) and particularly Meindl (2004: 70) provide a theoretical explanation that may back such a claim when he argues that the first-person has a narrating persona who functions as ‘the prime source of narrative unreliability and subjectivity’. Such a statement implies that the ‘I’ in a first-person narrated text can be a signal of unreliability. The signal may also aid the reader to interpret a text as a first-person homodiegetic form. According to Nünning/Nünning (2004: 121) the textual markers for unreliability may include explicit contradictions within the narrator’s comments, the inclusion of contrasting versions of the same event, discrepancies between statements and actions of the narrator, contradictions between the self-characterization of the narrator and the characterization of the narrator by other characters, and discrepancies between his or her accounts and interpretation of events. Further signals of unreliability, according to the narratologists mentioned above, include repeated attempts by the narrator to influence the reader’s response or attitude, recurrence of subjective comments, references to memory lapses, a deliberate partisan attitude, addresses to the reader, a narrator’s insistence on his or her credibility or lack of credibility and various paratextual signals such as title, subtitle and preface. Some of these signals will be useful in interpreting, differentiating and analyzing Byron’s narrative poems in the first-person.

\textsuperscript{166} For the same emphasis, see Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 88).
Since the process of reading and constructing meaning based on perspective structure applies to both first-person and authorial heterodiegetic narrated texts, attention needs to be paid to how the notion of perspective may aid in the analysis of a text as first-person. The notion of character-perspective can be applied to poems constructed in the first-person with a homodiegetic narrator. In this case, one needs to further differentiate between the perspective of the ‘narrating ‘I’ and that of the ‘experiencing ‘I’, i.e. between the perspective of the narrator as narrator and his or her former perspective as character in the fictional world (Allrath 2005: 23). Since most homodiegetically narrated texts often focus on the difference between a young and inexperienced protagonist and his or her more mature and wiser self as narrator (Allrath 2005: 23), the parameters for analyzing first-person texts must consider the perspective of the narrating ‘I’ and that of the experiencing ‘I’. Ansgar Nünning (2001: 218) has attempted to provide a relevant explanation as to how the concept of perspective structure can be analytically applied to the discussion of first-person texts:

First-person narratives usually involve two main perspectives: the narrator-perspective represents the private domain of the homodiegetic narrator, whose world view is conditioned by the knowledge, psychological dispositions, attitudes, and values of the narrating ‘I.’ Telling the story in retrospect and knowing its outcome, the narrating I has a wider perspective than the narrated or experiencing I, who previously inhabited the time and space of the story level [...]. Since the first-person narrator remembers what the narrated I knew, experienced, thought, and felt, the character-perspective of the experiencing I is embedded in the cognitive domain of the narrating I.

Perspective structure in first-person homodiegetic narration places emphasis on two main issues: the character-perspective is the perspective of the experiencing ‘I’, while the narrator-perspective is that of the narrating ‘I’. Recollections could become some of the parameters by which the character-perspective of the experiencing ‘I’ is embedded in the cognitive world of the narrating ‘I’, and perform narrative functions.

Instances of parallipsis and transgressions may mark a narrative text as a first-person form. Nünning/Nünning (2004: 112) have the following to say:

the first-person narrator is part of the same world as the characters gives rise to a further characteristic of the first-person narrative situation: only the internal processes, thoughts and feelings of the narrating and experiencing I can be related. First-person narrators have no insight into the consciousness of the other characters; they

Cf. Ansgar Nünning (2001: 219). He states that there exists a discrepancy between the actual textual world and the subjective world-model of the experiencing ‘I’ and the often partial recollections of the homodiegetic narrator. One equally needs to point out that, even though the narrating ‘I’ possesses some cognitive advantages; the agent is deprived of omniscience.
can only surmise what the thoughts and feelings of the others may be. First-person narrators are also restricted by the barriers of human cognition and physical limitations in further ways: those first-person narrators who present themselves as eyewitnesses and vouch for the fictional accuracy of their account must be present at the scene of the events that they relate [...]. A retrospective first-person narrator can generally review the entire past events leading up to the present of the narrating I, but unlike the ‘omniscient’ authorial narrator he or she is not able to look into the feature.

Such an elaboration on the restrictions of first–person narrators has consequences for any analysis of homodiegetic narration in any given text. The physical and cognitive restrictions imposed on first-person narrators would also mean that any attempt to report the internal processes of other characters (without naming the source of the information) including instances of claiming much knowledge (parallipsis)\textsuperscript{168} would be regarded as indicators for narrative voice in the first-person.

A further and hardly emphasized category of mediation that may encourage a reading of a text as first-person, and consequently enhance an interpretation of a textual device as a link between narratology and cultural narratology is the category called communal voice. When dealing with narratorial voice against such a background, the way a particular historical community or even ideology is represented by narrative means needs to be considered. The specific post colonial ideology of subject and subjectivity enters Byron’s poetry by means of culture-symbolic subjects such as narrating animals. The animals or non-human agents could be important parameters for the construction of communal voice or even perspective in the poetry under study. They cause action that guides the narrative and is, consequently, can be given a linguistic identity. The linguistic reference can be marked by such forms by ‘I’ and ‘we’ especially in first-person narrated texts. When this is the case, the object is transformed into a textual subject. In my context, the ‘I’, or ‘we’ strategy features in the autobiographical narrative “The Prisoner of Chillon” modeled on post colonial issues of slavery and dehumanization, power, voicelessness, subject and subjection, and can enable an understanding of the story through the eyes of a narrator who is representing his/her own voice or that of a particular community. Given that dehumanizing references to humans as animals may draw attention to the plight of postcolonial creatures, the very evidence may as well help to enhance the reader’s understanding of the post colonial discourses’s emphasis on the relationship between the master (Britain) and the colonized. The narrative concept of communal voice, which the study proposes for conceptualizing the specific cultural issue of

\textsuperscript{168} See Jahn (2005: N3.3.15) echoing Genette.
collective voice may become an important factor in the exploration of the link between narrative theory and cultural history.

Other forms which narratology conceptualizes under consciousness representation strategies exist and may serve as further characteristics of first-person narrative situations. Although I have discussed consciousness representation strategies in third-person texts, the point needs to be made that first-person narrators also make themselves known by means of thought representation categories hence they need to be considered in transgeneric discussion of the form and functions of first-person homodiegetic narrated texts. Such a separation is intended to guide the reader’s understanding that first-person reflectors exist - a distinction hardly emphasized in the analysis of Byron’s poetry. The first group of markers for discussing the reflector mode in the first-person are those used by the first-person narrator to reproduce his/her past consciousness, or what Cohn (1978) calls self-reproducing techniques, understood to mean ways by which narrators tell their own stories or the stories of their past selves in autobiographical fiction.169

Textual evidence of the manifestation of the reflector mode in first-person-texts would be gauged by means of consciousness devices that Cohn (1978: 144) elaborates under retrospective techniques. Those forms by which the narrating self (the enlightened and knowing narrator) elucidates the past mental life of his experiencing self are dissonant self-narration, consonant self-narration, self-quoted monologue, and self-narrated monologue. We will concentrate on the first two because they are evident in some of Byron’s narrative verses.

Dissonant self-narration, which Cohn (1978: 145) also calls retrospective mental narration, can be a technique for reproducing the first-person narrator’s past inner life in Byron’s poetry in the same way it does in autobiographical narrative. In this mode of narration, it is the distanced, wise, discursive, knowing or present-time narrating voice (the narrating ‘I’) that attempts to create the past life of his experiencing self - self that did not

169 See Cohn’s (1978: 155) four techniques to rendering consciousness in the first person, subsumed under retrospective techniques. Cohn (1978) extends her analysis of self-reproducing techniques to include retrospective narration and argues that the narrating and the experiencing self can be embedded in the figural identity. See also Rivara’s (2004: 97) corroborative and insightful statement that ‘autobiographical narrative may give the reader immediate access to the narrator’s consciousness, […] and, more importantly, what he remembers of his past life’. In Cohn’s (1978: 144; 155) words, problems of ambiguity may arise from the analysis of such autobiographical retrospective narration. One of such problems is that self narration constitutes the submerging of the narrating and the experiencing self with the result that the two selves may be joined in the first-person pronoun ‘I’; Rivara (2004: 102-103) also elaborates the narrative and linguistic ambiguities likely to feature in autobiographical narratives. For more on the illustrations of the relationship between the present-time narrator ‘I’, and past-time character ‘I’ in retrospective narration, see Chatman (1986: 194-195), and McHalle (1981: 183-193).
know itself at the moment of experience or perception. The reader needs to be aware that the narrator telling the story is older and wiser than the past self who was cognitively deficient at the time of events. This means that at the moment the event occurred, the experiencing self was naïve and cognitively unproductive. One of the markers by which a reader can construct the perception or past consciousness of the homodiegetic (autodiegetic) narrator is the technique of memory. Markers of memory, suggested by Cohn (1978: 148; 151), are mental vocabulary, verbs of cognition like ‘seems’, and ‘appear’, for instance, and imagistic patterns which may suggest the privilege of the narrating self over the experiencing self. Other clues that would serve to distance the narrating from the experiencing self are the use of the past tense, forms of self-quotations and adverbs. The narrative technique of memory can serve important functions in the analysis of poems dealing with questions of romanticism and narrative. “The Prisoner of Chillon”, as will be demonstrated in due course, appears to engage the question of identity in autobiography or that of the voice or community of the oppressed that is represented in the text.

Another mental technique that will be helpful in any attempt to retrieve the mental life of the homodiegetic (autodiegetic) narrator and thus for the analysis of first-person narration in terms of functions is called consonant self-narration. Cohn (1978: 156), on whose criterion I draw, understands consonant self-narration as a mode of narration in which the event (whether dream, recollection or perception) often coincides with telling, revealing no gap between the experiencing self and the narrating self as the case of retrospective (distanced) self-narration. One form of this type of first-person narration is called simultaneous narration, also proposed by Hühn (2004) as we saw earlier. Since this type of narration shows the narrator identifying with their past self, certain important markers of simultaneous narration according to Cohn (1978: 156, 157) would include the first-person pronoun, temporal adverbs denoting spontaneity and immediacy, psychic vocabulary, sensations, feelings, absence of reference to the past tense and deitics such as ‘then’ and ‘now’. Cohn’s (1978: 157) statement that the narrator evokes the past in this mode of narration as though it

---

170 Rivara (2004: 98) is also of the opinion that the past life of the autobiographical narrator can only be brought to life by means of ‘a retrospective vision, memory being his only source of information’.

171 Cohn (1978: 155) regrets that simultaneous narration has generally been ignored by theorists of the novel who have continued to analyse first-person narration according to the ‘classical model of distanced memorialist’ who ‘retraces from the point of view of a later time the earlier course of his life […]’ Cohn might be understood as saying that narration is seen as past in the eyes of certain classical narratologists (we shall come back to this point). What Cohn says of the theorists of the novel is also true of poetry in general and Byron’s poetry in particular. I am not aware of any narrative reviewer of Byron’s poetry who has employed tense styles to analyse narration as this study intends to do.
were the present, no matter whether he/she uses the past or the present tense, needs to be considered when one attempts to analyze a first-person text in the light of simultaneous narration. These and the mental styles analyzed under dissonant self-narration can constitute hallmarks of the type of self-narration exemplified in the first part of “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” III.

The reader needs to be reminded that self-quoted monologue may constitute yet another fruitful strategy for the analysis of first-person texts. If quotation marks and forms of quoting the past self like ‘I blamed myself’ exist in a text, they would likely encourage such a reading. To sum up this section, any analysis of narration in first-person narrated poems aiming to construct both narrative and contexts may be incomplete if the above analytical devices are not considered. We now turn to analyze mental narrative strategies that may be helpful for our analysis of Byron’s poems written in the third-person figural mode.

2.5 The Figural Narrative Situation: Strategies for Reading, Interpretation and Analysis

Narratorial figural mode is a category of transgeneric narrative theory of poetry that is important for my analysis of narration in Byron’s poetry. Considering its relevance as a conceptual, differential, interpretive and analytical category, it is important that this study draws on the insights of narrative theorists of mediation to provide clues by which a reader can identify the technique in any given poem. Since the reflector mode occurs in both first-person and third-person poetic texts written by Byron, we will consider consciousness representation strategies proposed by Cohn (1978) and other narrative theorists for the analysis of narration in the figural mode. Considering that certain thought representation strategies for analyzing mediation in first-person narrated texts are already discussed above, we will consider only those for the representation of narration in third-person texts in this section. We now turn to the strategies of analysis which may suggest a reading of any text as figural, and which will be used subsequently as methodological tools to analyse the forms and functions of narration in Byron’s poetry. An explanation of the notion of the figural mode is an important starting point for any discussion on its forms of textual evidence.

According to Nünning/Nünning (2004: 155), the figural narrative situation gives the reader the impression of direct access into the ‘perceiving, thinking or feeling character’. The
point the narratologists try to emphasize is that this mode of narration gives the reader the impression of following events through the eyes or perspective of one of the characters (Nüning/Nünning (2004: 155)) since what is textually revealed is the impression of ‘immediate access to the perceptions and internal processes of a character’. What is clear now is that the reflector mode, which can be analyzed in both the first-person and third-person figural texts, is not verbal narration in the manner in which the authorial heterodiegetic and some first-person homodiegetic narrators tell their stories, but exists in mental forms best articulated by Cohn (1978) as consciousness representation strategies, and by Fludernik (1996: 345) as parameters of ‘viewing and experiencing’ (aiming to separate this agency from ‘telling or action’ frames).

Narratorial reflector mode in third-person texts may be indicated by the use of third-person references although personal pronouns have nothing to do with consciousness markers we are analyzing here. Following this criterion, a reflector or internal focalizer will be textually named as ‘he’, or ‘she’. Although such a criterion is useful, it has its own shortcomings since first-person reflectors are often identified in the ‘I’ linguistic reference specifically the ‘experiencing I’. Nonetheless, I would argue that, far from being identified in the third-person references as the authorial heterodiegetic narrator, the figural or reflector mode is also often covert. While covert markers would also suggest the presence of a reflector, these, at the same time, allow the reader narratological evidence to draw a distinguishing line between the first-person and the authorial narrative situations that clearly structure narration in identifiable or individualized speakers.

Another important strategy for the reader to locate figural narration and discuss its functions is the category called indirect discourse (psychonarration). Psychonarration or indirect speech gives the impression that the character’s mind is described in the authorial narrator’s language and not that of the story internal character him/herself. Cohn’s (1978: 21) argument that ‘third-person novels dwell on manifest behavior, with the characters’ inner selves revealed only indirectly through spoken language and telling gesture’ may substantiate the point that in psychonarration, it is psychic states that are emphasized via the language of the narrator. Such an argument implies that, by definition, the technique of psychonarration can be useful to describe a quoted report by a ‘vocal authorial narrator’ (Cohn 1978: 22) of what a character is thinking. The description of the technique of psychonarration is directly linked to the inner life of a fictional character. If to Cohn (1978: 46), psychonarration presents what the character knows in a narrator’s knowing words, the issue to engage at this stage is to
specify the stylistic features of psychonarration by which both the narrator’s cognitive knowledge of the character’s mental life and the reflector would be accounted for.

Psychonarration takes two forms. One of the techniques of psychonarration that is capable of answering questions in poetry dealing with a character’s mind is dissonant psychonarration. This technique is often deployed when a narrator who, even as he focuses intently on an individual psyche, remains emphatically distanced from the consciousness he narrates (Cohn 1978: 26). Consonant psychonarration is the contrary device suited to describe a narrator who fuses with the consciousness he narrates. This implies that a narrative report of what the character is thinking, for instance, may come through by means of dissonant and consonant psychonarrative forms. Such forms could be exemplified by psychic verbs such as ‘he thought’, for instance, and would be relevant for my construction of the figural character and its uses. In the case of consonant psychonarration, an indicator that creates an impression of ‘cohesion’ especially when ‘thoughts and feelings are intertwined with sensations’ (Cohn 1978: 31) can be imagery. Images play a part in the analysis of psychonarration as consonant in the following ways. By associating images with the character’s state of mind, the narrator’s knowledge of the character’s psyche may seem to coincide with the character’s self-knowledge (Cohn 1978: 31). Verbs and nouns of consciousness can also be useful as markers by which the fusion of authorial and figural voices in psychonarration can be traced. If psychonarration depicts what a character ‘knows’ in a narrator’s ‘knowing words’ (Cohn 1978: 46), then psychonarration can be helpful in analyzing inner experiences that are not verbal.

What is relevant for my discussion of the strategy of psychonarration as a technique for the analysis of consciousness in Byron’s poetry is imagination. Imaginary perceptions often originate from ‘thinking and dreaming minds’ and are ‘often introduced by phrases that signal a character’s perception of the surrounding world’.172 In the same line of thought, cognitive verbs that may signal mental activities such as ‘he imagined’ may aid the reader in analyzing a text as psychonarration. While a reader can use markings of psychonarration to analyze visions, dreams, or the mind of the reflector, the role the device may be assigned as an omniscient cognitive indicator in authorial narrated texts is that it makes the hidden areas of the mind available to the reader as literary material. Following Cohn’s theoretical reflections, psychonarration of an authorial type has particular relevance for the interpretation

172 Cohn (1978: 41; 50) introduces psychoanalogy as a technique to depict consciousness in third-person texts.
of third-person texts in Byron’s poetry. One needs to add that psychonarration can also be signaled by the linguistic criteria of the third-person singular and the past tense and may be useful for constructing the narrative tradition in poetry. In addition, the technique will be useful in accounting for the extent to which Byron provided new material for constructing psychological characters (similar to the type found in modern novels) in poetry. Psychonarration will thus provide narrative evidence to speak about the new forms Byron introduced into poetry, or made available for writing narrative poetry.

The project’s aim to broaden the scope of transgeneric narratological categories for the interpretation and analysis of narration and its relationship to context would be incomplete without consideration for metaphors or psychoanalogies. The narrator’s ability to take the reader directly into the mind, consciousness, perception, thoughts, and the feelings of a character as a way of providing information about how the reflecting mind can be constructed is important here. Cohn’s (1978: 44) argument that psychoanalogies often occur in works where the narrated monologue is the prevailing method for the depiction of consciousness (and also in moments when an author is for some reason unwilling to entrust the presentation of inner life to the character’s own verbal competence) has important consequences for my analysis of how the figural mode reveals itself by means of imagery. Textual evidence of psychoanalogies would include similes and metaphors. To make any given metaphor or simile an element of figural mode, the reader needs to consider whether the subconscious association of things originates in the mind of the reflector-character or in that of the narrator. If the psychological association of things is judged to be the imagination of the story’s internal character, then narration can be said to contain elements of the reflector mode. If, on the other hand, the act of imagistic associations originates in the mind of the narrator, who may also be reporting the character’s thoughts or feelings, the mode of narration may be omniscience or even psychonarration. The technique of psychoanalogy has profound implications for the reproduction of consciousness or fictive minds in Byron’s narrative poetry. The process of constructing meaning by means of metaphorical analogies is linked to the way narrative poetry can structure stories in the mind in the manner of modern novels that also construct psychological characters. Such an argument is aided by the fact that the association of events

---

173 My application of metaphors or imagery to narration as a form of reflectorial manifestation also harks back on Nünning/Nüning’s (2004: 69) ‘substitution theory’, which is linked to metaphorical presentation of events. This may provide a basis for the study to include imagery or metaphor into narratological interpretation of narration and to highlight specific ways consciousness representation techniques can transform a textual mind into literary material for the purpose of meaning-making.
or things in imagistic patterns often takes place in the mind of a fictional character. Given that the techniques of psychoanalogies and psychonnaration constitute some of the ways Byron’s poetry construct or tell stories, it may not be an overstatement to suggest that the said poetry provides narrative material analogous to forms found in modern prose fiction (an example of which is James Joyce’s *A Portrait of The Artist as a Young Man*). The analysis of metaphorical analogies encourages an understanding that the reflecor character of figural narrative situation can be found in the text through the mental activity of psychoanalogy that the mind itself performs.

It would be insufficient to talk about mental styles of analyzing ‘inside views’ in narrative poems without mentioning interior monologue or the stream of consciousness technique which it embeds. Narratologists, including Jahn (2005) as mentioned above, have understood the stream of consciousness to be an attempt to present a character’s consciousness, his/her mental processes, often depicting perceptions mingling with half-conscious thoughts and memories through random associations. The association of stream of consciousness, mental processes and perceptions with Byron’s poetry already foregrounds the latter’s relationship with narratological notions of the figural or reflecor mode since this mood is best conveyed by means of perceptual and consciousness strategies. The definition of stream of consciousness implies that in order to analyse consciousness in first person texts, the reader must look for the subject of the verbs of consciousness, and for evidence of sense perceptions, memories, dreams, emotions and feelings. In order to analyze the forms and uses of the stream of consciousness technique in a poetic text or a fragment of it, the reader can


\[175\] Jahn (2005: N8.8) explains that the term ‘stream of of consciousness’ was coined by William James to denote the disjointed character of mental processes and is now used to explain the textual presentation of mental processes. This is the case especially when the reader attempts to capture the random, irregular, disjointed, associative, and incoherent character of these processes. Jahn draws attention to the fact that stream of consciousness technique flourished in the literary scene in the works of 19th and 20th century novelists such as Virginia Woolf, and James Joyce among others, who attempted to engage in textual representations of the mental processes. Although Byron wrote poetry in the 18th century Romantic period (during which the technique was not known in the literary scene), traces of the device are discernible in his poetry, as will be demonstrated. For more on the device, see Cohn (1978: 76-78). One remark is also worthy of note here: by way of definition, stream of consciousness and interior monologue appear as synonyms since both techniques encourage the reader to follow events through the mind of the reflecor. Even though the term is sometimes used interchangeably with interior monologue, the distinction that is drawn is that the former can include narratorial intervention whereas in the interior monologue, the narrator recedes into the background in a way that the self and the vagaries of mental processes are far more directly presented, ignoring any requirement for grammatical correctness or logical order. (Cf. Cohn 1999: 100; see also Peck 1996: 35)
also look for textual indicators of the interior monologue (quoted monologue), direct thought and free indirect thought.^{176}

A closely related category that needs to be integrated in the plethora of consciousness strategies to analyze consciousness and its uses in third-person poems is the interior monologue.^{177} The device of interior monologue may be represented by certain characteristics of form and content including the extensive use of first-person singular and the present tense.^{178} The interior monologue can also be identified by indicators for mental processes of the internal character. Nünning/Nünning (2004: 126) further point out that elements such as time, place and the external world are only present as elements of the mental processes, filtered through the perspective of the subject. Some of the former characteristics of the interior monologue analyzed by these narratologists are important for my analysis of narration. These include the omission of all verbs of thinking and feeling, the complete removal of any mediating instance from the narrative, the presentation of the character’s mental processes in his/her own language, grammatical or stylistic idiosyncrasies, elliptical syntax and the omission of punctuation. Following the criterion of content, the two narrative theorists make it clear that the interior monologue is different from other modes of presenting consciousness ‘in the directness with which it relates perception and mental processes, in the central role played by free association as an organizational principle, in its reduction of linguistic and thematic coherence, as well as in the illusion of immediacy it aims to create’ (126). An example that will serve to illustrate the use of the device of interior monologue shall be a narrative fragment from “The Corsair” (at a later point in the analysis section).

Interior monologue can also be signaled by fragmentary and discontinuous syntax. Cohn (1978: 92) notes that some of its stylistic tendencies may be discerned in the form of unanswered questions, exclamations, invocations, invectives or curses addressing various absent people, human and divine, and unfinished sentences all signifying discontinuous speech patterns. Another important clue to make visible the interior monologue as suggested by Cohn is the absence of colloquial language that may create the impression of

^{176} Cf. Jahn’s proposal (2005: N8.9) that stream of consciousness or inside views of a character can be represented by interior monologue, direct thought, and free indirect thought.

^{177} The reader should note that the stream of consciousness and interior monologue are two distinct devices. Nünning/Nünning (2004: 125) provide a corroborative argument, informing the reader that stream of consciousness refers to the content of the interior monologue which is itself only one of several modes that present consciousness.

communicating meaning to the interlocutor, and one may add introspection. Although the
figural mode is not emphasized in Byron’s narrative verse, extensive fragments of it exist that
are mostly characterized by some of the identified techniques above, as shall be demonstrated
in my analysis of “The Corsair”, “Lara” and other poems.

The question of how a narrative poem (or simply a fragment of it) can create the
illusion of psychological rather than purely physical action can be answered by looking for
designations of a mind thinking, feeling, dreaming and perceiving, conceptualized as free
indirect discourse (narrated monologue). Free indirect discourse is often understood to
imply a technique that leads the reader directly into the internal processes of the character in
the character’s own language while maintaining third-person references. Since we are

---

179 The term ‘free indirect discourse’ has sparked controversy in narratology regarding its definition.
Methodological problems that often arise from the use of the terminology, particularly ambiguity, need to be
addressed here. The first problem that often results in ambiguity is that of definition. On the one hand, free
indirect discourse is seen as performing the singular role of representing the thoughts and speech of a
character (Cohn 1978; Gunn 2004: 35-55) in the character’s own language. On the other hand, Pascal (1977)
describes it as ‘dual voice’. The definition of free indirect discourse also features ambiguity at the level of its
textual indicators such as the use of sentences or verbs of consciousness, past tense and third-person
references since these are likely to coalesce in a fusion of the figural thoughts and narratorial voice.
Consequently, the reader is often left uncertain as to the origin of the verbs of consciousness, as Moshe Ron
points out (1981: 35). When Roy Pascal describes free indirect discourse as an element of figural mode that
plays a dialogic role in its potential for merging the authorial voice and figural consciousness (dual voice), he
is, in the manner of Gunn (2004: 35) and Prince (2001: 59), invoking the crucial problem of ambiguity.
What makes this fusion possible, according to Cohn (1981: 172), is the fact that most third-person texts
incorporate reflector forms in the past tense, coalescing in a fusion of the voice of a seemingly ‘narratorless’
reflector with that of the narratorless linguistic structure of free indirect speech. Another problem that arises
from the use of the term ‘free indirect discourse’ is the profusion of different names for the same concept,
and I would like to remark that the use of different names often entails different connotations for the term.
The different terminologies for the concept such as free indirect discourse or ‘dual voice’ (Roy Pascal),
‘embedding’ (Mieke Bal), ‘double focalization’, (Phelan 2001) and ‘narrated monologue’ or ‘stylistic
contagion’ (Cohn 1978) only point to the difficulty that may arise in any attempt to decide whether the
emotional tone, judgements, or subjective thoughts should be attributed to the figural character or simply
considered as narratorial report or perception. Roy Pascal (1977), like McHale (1981) and Cohn (1978), has
paid particular attention to the role of this narratorial technique as an indicator of silent thoughts and speech
of a character, to borrow McHale’s (1981) phrase. However, Cohn, unlike McHale and Pascal, restricts free
indirect discourse to the representation of consciousness alone, mindful of the fact that the mind as a whole
suggests other components that can be covered by the device including conjectures, beliefs, memory,
emotions and knowledge, subsumed under psychological facets of focalization (see Rimmon-Kenan 1983:
79). For the definitions and extensive discussions on free indirect discourse in general, see Roy Pascal

180 Cf. Nünning/Nünning (2004: 125), Cohn (1978: 103) and also Gunn’s (2004: 35) explanations that,
in contrast to narrative commentary, free indirect discourse leaves the reader with the impression that the
narrator supposedly withdraws or disappears in favour of impersonal figural representation. See also Jahn
(2005: N1.23) for a similar argument. I argue here that free indirect discourse is used in a narrative fragment
of “Child Harold’s Pilgrimage” IV in a manner that approximates what Pascal calls dual voice. What one
finds is a conjunction of free indirect discourse (or character’s thoughts) with a trustworthy, authoritative
narratorial voice [...] repeatedly intertwine with narratorial commentary, sometimes within the same
sentence (Gunn’s phrase; 35). Those like Cohn (1978), who has restricted the potential of the device by
casting it exclusively in the role of representing the autonomous figural discourse, will see such an analysis
as pervasive or insufficient. My argument that free indirect discourse is used in Byron’s poetry in a way that
dealing with ways by which the figural mode can be identified and staged in Byron’s poetry, it is important to consider Gunn’s (2004: 35) definition of the technique of free indirect discourse as ‘a representation of figural speech and thought’. The presence of clues such as loose syntax, questions, exclamations, and other signals of subjectivity (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 125) may be evidence of free indirect discourse and of ways a reader gets access into the internal processes of a textual character. Since certain forms of language convey the illusion that what is emphasized is the activity of cognition and not a physical event, what Cohn calls psychological vocabulary (often linguistically discernible in verbs of consciousness) may constitute further clues for locating free indirect discourse in a narrative text. It should be noted, however, that free indirect discourse has been regarded as a merging of figural thought and narratorial report. Of importance is the fact that the technique of free indirect discourse has the dimension of focalization. Prince’s (2001: 59) description of the technique as a blend of narrator’s focalization and voice with character’s focalization only confirms Pascal’s (1977) argument that free indirect discourse plays a dialogic role in its potential of merging authorial voice with figural consciousness. What makes the fusion possible is that most third-person texts incorporate reflector forms in the past tense. In my analysis of Byron’s poems that make use of the technique of free indirect discourse, emphasis will be paid on Jahn’s (2005: NI.23) techniques of third-person reference, verbs of thought, past tense, and a lack of quotation marks. The reader needs to be reminded that the absence of any discernible transitions, the characteristic fusion of outer and inner reality, gestures with thoughts, facts with reflections, the employment of the same basic tense (past tense) for the narrator’s reporting language and the character’s reflecting language, and the resulting fusion of the two ‘normally distinct linguistic currents’ (Cohn 1978: 136) would result in no formal difference between free indirect discourse and a plain narratorial statement. But if the juxtaposition of figural thoughts and narratorial voice in free indirect discourse results in a lack of reliable linguistic criteria for the location of the technique, and for making discriminations - then with what clues can a reader recognize a narrated monologue or mark creates the impression of an interaction between figural thought and narratorial voice (as will be shown in analysis) is intended to guide the reader’s understanding of Byron’s peculiar narrative style.

181 Jahn (2005: NI.23) attempts to analyse the ambiguity that is likely to result from the use of free indirect discourse when he explains that the technique transposes pronouns and tenses into the pronoun/tense system of the narrative’s ordinary sentences, pointing out the ways it does it: it may shift a first person into a third person, and the present tense into the past, often revealing no quotation marks, no identification of speaker or thinker as in quoted monologue.

thought patterns as distinct from pure narration? The question of how one can mark a depersonalized narrator in sentences containing free indirect discourse, and also, that of theoretical grounds on which the boundary between the two can be marked has been answered but requires attention here. According to Moshe Ron, a reliable criterion would begin with the following questions: ‘Was something perceived? Who perceived it? […] Who told the narrator these things?’ Such a criterion suggests that any attempt to identify free indirect discourse and its clues must begin by considering if the description is the account of the character’s perception, or the narrator’s account (23). Cohn (1978: 174), however, provides more reliable criteria. Free indirect discourse in third person texts uses the past tense. Free indirect discourse in first person texts cast in the stream of consciousness uses past tense for an autodiegetic narrator. Further markers of free indirect discourse styles of speech and thought would include ‘modality’ or modal verbs, such as ‘should’, ‘must’, ‘had to’, ‘could’, ‘might’, ‘would’, and adverbs such as ‘certainly’, ‘perhaps’, ‘may be’, ‘of course’, especially when they function to disclose a character’s consciousness. The role of deictic or demonstrative expressions such as ‘now’, ‘then’, ‘however’, ‘hence’, ‘there’, ‘questions’, ‘interjections’, reporting verbs of speaking, thinking, quotation marks, personal and possessive pronouns in the third person when marking a narrative text as free indirect discourse need to be emphasized. Free indirect discourse can be identified and analyzed by means of contextual clues, particularly tone. In addition, the criterion based on context clues require that, if the sentence that follows or precedes the quoted thought is ‘embedded’ in a recognizable thought sequence, it might be possible to attribute the statement to a figural mind (see Jahn 2005: NI.23). According to this concept and other criteria, the sentences that conjure up the impression of thought processes in the mind of a character will be considered in my analysis of narration as indicators of free indirect discourse. While the above clues will aid the study to attribute thought, emotional tone, and subjective impressions to the agent or reflector

---

183 For discussions of the impossibility of finding reliable linguistic criteria to reduce ambiguities characteristic of mimetic texts that allow the attribution of voice and focalization, see Moshe Ron (1981: 35), Jahn, and Cohn cited above.

184 See Toolan (2001 [1988]). On the question of free indirect discourse, direct discourse, indirect discourse and their different markers, see Rimmon-Kenan’s (1983: 109-114) elaborate discussion on devices which constitute linguistic features (110-113) and functions (111; 114) covering speaker identification, the encouragement of ‘bivocality’ or ‘polyvocality’ often resulting in a plurality of speakers and attitudes, ambiguity that dramatizes problematic relations between utterance and its origin, its role for reporting stream of consciousness especially for indirect interior monologue, its role in constructing implied author’s attitude, ironic distancing, tinting of the narrator’s speech with the character’s language, and the characteristic polyphonic quality. For more on functions of free indirect discourse, see McHale (1988).
from whom thought or comment originates, they will aid the study to discuss Byron’s contribution to the development of narrative in poetry.

Adverbs form another group of markers for free indirect discourse. These include temporal adverbs such as ‘today’, ‘here’, ‘now’ and ‘yesterday’. Their appearance in narrated monologues would constitute important tools for the study to locate the narrative perspective within the psyche of a character (see Cohn 1978: 128). If one consents to Prince’s (2001: 46) and Chatman’s (1986) notion of focalization with its interdictions on narrators as focalizers\(^\text{185}\) (on grounds that the narrator is located in discourse unlike the character that one finds in the story and could never have experienced the event), however, it is logical to assume that such deictics as ‘now’, ‘this’, ‘here’ may locate the scene of action and can guide the reader to attribute certain judgements in the passage to the internal focalizer who is also located on the scene of action.

It seems appropriate to suggest that strategies for staging consciousness or those that generally describe the mind in action proposed by Palmer (2002: 32) can enter the transgeneric approach for the analysis of figural mode in poetry. If any given text contains features that signal mental processes such as dreaming, introspection, reflecting, seeing and conceiving, it may be associated with the reflector. There is no doubt that, writing as far back as the 18th-century Romantic period when, apparently, nothing was known about psychological representation of fictional characters or minds, Byron did not read Freud, James Joyce, Virginia Woolf, Cohn and Palmer, to name a few. Yet, based on his use of mental processes and psychological characters in narrative poems, one may be right to say that he foregrounded modern prose fiction. This claim can be backed up with the profusion of narrative evidence in his poetry such as the use of free indirect discourse, interior monologue, forms of psychonarration, and self-reproducing techniques. In due course, these devices will shed light on what Byron’s poetry provides for the analysis of figural narration, and by extension—the creation of narrative tradition and will also contribute to enhance thinking on the link between the poetry under study and the literary cultures that it reproduces and vice versa.

\(^{185}\) For the use of the phrase, see Phelan (2001: 60).
2.6 Tense, Narratorial Voice and Focalization

[T]ense [...] serves to distinguish or individuate participants in the story world what I refer to as the ‘participant tracking function’ [...] There is a motivation for the affinity between individuation and (tense) [...] or at least [...] individuated actions [...].

Narrators are not obliged to choose one of these modes of representations and stick to it; they can move from one to another by an appropriate shift in tense, and in so doing adopt the ‘narrating persona’ of the mode in question.

Fleischman (1990: 81; 63)

The application of narratology to poetry that Hühn and Schöner (2005) postulated saw the introduction into poetry criticism of the typology of mediacy and encouraged the inclusion into transgeneric theory of poetry of tense forms that may trigger the illusion of narration and focalization. An important narrative constituent that has been ignored in transgeneric narratological conception of the link between narrative and poetry is tense aspects. The implications of using tense categories as a transgeneric narratological factor in the reconceptualization of narration and focalization and their link to contexts cannot be ignored in this study due to the uses that can be made of simultaneous narration, retrospective narration, and prospective narration in the analysis of narrative transmission in Byron’s poetry. The negligence in using tense styles to construct narrative situations and levels is less noticeable in in extant literature on Byron’s poetry. Previous research on tense in narrative theory has conceptualized it as an important factor in locating events in time, as Fleischman (1990) remarks. Hence, there appear to have been a disregard for its relationship to mediation and cultural issues, which this study seeks to explore in the light of Byron’s poetry. In addition, classical narratology, especially in the light of Genette (1980) and his followers have attempted to draw the narrative boundary that separates different narratorial voices and also their modes of mediation and to analyze these concepts based on the criteria of level, mode, voice, person, and other linguistic features with less consideration for the use of tense categories in constructing voice and focalization. Fleischman (1990: 216) regrettabley points out that there has been little acknowledgement for the significant role played by categories of
the verb, notably tense aspect, in the linguistic encoding of point of view. Such an argument already implies that I wish to consider tense as an important factor in the reconceptualization of narration and focalization and their link to contexts. Such an argument also has further implications for the ways tense will be made to play narrative roles in the identification, interpretation and analysis of narrating agents and for the construction and attribution of focalization in Byron’s poetry. The innovative extension of transgeneric narratology to include tense categories is important because it has already been recognized that tense play a relevant role as narrative category.

In contrast to research that studies tense in terms of ‘grammaticalization of location in time’ (Fleischman 1990: 15; 32), and which are often specifically concerned to discuss tense in terms of the restricted function of locating reference time in discourse, as Fleischman and Ricoeur have done, this study discusses tense with respect to narrative communication and contexts, involving narrators, perceivers, or thinkers. My concern is with the ways the presence of tense categories can allow for conclusive statements about narration, focalization and contexts in a narrative text. To attempt to adapt tense to narrative communication and context is therefore to find out if and how tense categories can account for the speaker, the thinker and perceiver or conceiver verbalizing and perceiving (respectively) in narrative communication, and by extension create an awareness of their functions as analytical devices.

The primary concern of this section is on the role of tense categories (conceptualized in such reference terms as simultaneous narration, retrospective and prospective categories) in the reconceptualization and analysis of narration and focalization. The theoretical question instrumental to my reconceptualization of tense is one that engages with tense as an indicator of a textual subject or narrator, perceiver or thinker. As already pointed out above, the goal is whether the function of tense categories should be analysed to include the forms and functions, or uses in particular narrative situation types (Fleischman 1990: 23).

Tense enters the narrative poem through the cognitive activities of perception and memory (remembering), which are all relevant for any transgeneric narratological attempt seeking to provide linguistic evidence for narrative analyses of narration, focalization and possibly

---

186 For the only contributions up to date (that I am aware of) which have begun to conceptualize the interrelationship of tense and narratorial voice, and focalization, see Cohn (1978), Fleischman (1990) Paul Ricour (1998, vol.2), Rimmmon-Kenan (1983: 89). Fleischman (1990: 82; 84) provides an elaborate discussion on the functions of speech-introducing verbs’ or tense which includes participant indicators, character markers, its uses in evaluating the narrator’s relationship to story participants including his/her own character ‘I’; and that of tracking narrator and other story participants.
contexts. The cognitive link is that memory, a mental activity, is a narrative vehicle for retrieving past experiences. Another mental activity, (perception), can become a narrative marker for verbal reports that often signify mental processes and speaking as occurring simultaneously by means of present tense. The point I am making is that tense has an origin in a particular speaker or perceiver and would indubitably signal its origin. It is on such account that I argue that any attempt to update Hühn’s transgeneric narratological approach to mediation may be incomplete if tense is not taken into consideration since it has a subject function. I will attempt to show that tense is a device for marking narrative boundaries (Fleischman 1990: 168) or simply a tracking device for story participants and focalizers in Byron’s narrative verse.

Before the study engages to propose conceptual ways that may illustrate the role of tense aspects in constructing forms by which speakers, perceivers and thinkers enter the narrative and allow for a forging of certain functions, some clarifications is needed here. The difficulty of attributing voice, thought patterns and focalization based on tense categories may arise in three particular instances. In the first case, there is often a coincidence of voice and thought (perception) as in texts that construct simultaneous narration and also free indirect discourse. A further difficulty that may be encountered when making attributions based on tense aspect relates to a depersonalized speaker (unmarked); especially in the case of such narrative texts which eschew individualized references to the speaker or thinker as Fleischman (1990: 18) notes. The study however adopts Fleischman’s point of view that if explicit linguistic traces of the real speaker or real thinker or perceiver are effaced from a narrative text, there are other possible ways the agents in narrative communication can be accounted for using tense categories. Another difficulty often arises when there is coincidence of speaker and perceiver (or thinker) as in the first person homodiegetic narration that often constructs the experiencing self and the narrating self as belonging to the same grammatical person. The situation is more dubious when certain texts or fragments employ deictic forms like ‘then’, ‘now’, etc., making it difficult for the reader to tell which of the forms belongs to the past self, to the past moment of experiences, or even to the present self (narrating self) or the present moment of telling. Fleischman (1990: 18) has been quick to suggest a way by which such an ambiguity can be reduced. One of the possibilities she proposes is to separate the temporal reference, point or period in which the situation is located, from the speakers ‘now’, the moment at which the speaker produces the utterance in question so that the temporal references is established differently by the discourse as the ‘current narrative plane’ or ‘narrative present of the story’ (16).
Another strategy for the attribution of depersonalized texts to the real speakers or thinkers is the assumption that the speaker refers not to the ‘now’ of the author, but to what Fleischman (1990: 18) calls the ‘now’ of the author’s surrogate inside the text - the fictional speaker or narrator, whether or not that speaker refers to himself or herself as ‘I’. We now turn to textual markers for speakers, perceivers or thinkers in the dimension of tense.

2.7 Tense and Narrational Voice: Tense as Participant Tracking Phenomenon

This section is concerned to show diverse ways tense can serve to indicate a distinct voice as well as mark narrative boundaries (Fleischman 1990: 168). While some narrators narrate retrospectively, some do so simultaneously or even prospectively although the possibility that a narrator can apply different tense forms in the same narration is evident in Byron’s narrative poetry as will be accounted for in due course. Any discussion on the relationship between narratorial voice and tense logically begins with an understanding that narration, like focalization has tense contrast for different narrating agents, although the possibility of overlaps cannot be ruled out. What is needed as a first step in discussing the uses that can be made of a particular tense as a participant indicator is an understanding of the different tense types a given narrator is likely to use in narration. These tense types include retrospective narration, simultaneous narration, and prospective narration. Narration may be done retrospectively in the past tense, after events have occurred (Fleischman 1990: 216). It may be simultaneous with action and perception (Cohn 1999), meaning that the first-person experiencing self speaks of the event as he/she lives it with no temporal gap between the moment of experience and the moment of narration. Such a narrative mode is often described as the coincidence of the narrating and experiencing selves. Narration may also be prospective understood to mean that the narrator tells his her story in advance using will or shall; an exclusive prerogative fiction confers upon the heterodiegetic narrator. Each of the narrative situations may require different tenses, and may be found to engage different speakers and different strategies. It is to the question of if and how tense aspects can serve as markers of participants and of their distinctions in narrative situations (Fleischman 1990: 200) that we now turn attention.

Signs of a speaker or narrator can be identified by means of the past tense reconceptualized as retrospective narration. As quoted in Cohn (1999: 96), ‘stories must be
past, and the more past, one could say, the better for them in their quality as stories, and the better for their narrator, that drowning wizard of the past tense'. The impression created that narrative is past for the voice that tells it (Ricoeur II 1980: 169-190) may be understood to mean that the past tense is a marker for retrospective narration. Retrospective narration can thus be a suitable strategy with which to mark the narrator in the first-person autodiegetic and third-person authorial narrative situations. The first-person homodiegetic narrator may adopt the past tense in autobiographical narratives by means of memory forms to reproduce his/her past inner life. Memory device is often linked to the narrating ‘I’ who tells the story of the past self using such forms as the past tense or memory, what Fleischman (1990: 35) would call the ‘visualizing’ past. This explanation should also be understood to mean that even when the narrating and the experiencing ‘I’ or remembering self are one and the same person, or even when the past and present tense come together in homodiegetic autobiographical narration, the past is usually that of the younger self of the homodiegetic narrator while the present is that of the narrator’s present moment, the ‘now’ of narration. This implies that the eye witness perspective of the present moment of narration may derive from a combination of tense and aspects features expressing simultaneity with ‘now’ Fleischman (1990: 60). I am raising the point that any form of retrospective mental narration may create the impression that narration is told by the narrating self and can thus be considered as a marker of the presence of this narrating agent, and of autobiographical narration. The markers in the present tense form that include ‘now’ often bring narration closer to what Fleischman calls ‘performance’, and may create a sense of immediacy.

Simultaneous narration may be a reliable tense device for tracking speakers in the same way it does for focalization in a narrative communication act. In narration, as in focalization, narrating what one is perceiving, visualizing, thinking and doing is to speak of the speakers ‘now’ and of the speaker’s identity. On this basis, the present of narration often
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187 I do not however share with studies that categorically limits the role of tense to recalling the past such as Fleischman (1990: 23; 24; 32), Ricoeur (1980: 98), Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 89), since Byron’s narrative poetry structures narration both retrospectively, simultaneously in the present tense, and also prospectively only to an extent, in the future tense). I would argue that narration in the past tense is not always an objective indicator of the contrast that determines the narrator types in the first-person and third-person narrative texts. The past tense may be used in first-person narrative texts such as autobiographies, and in cases of retrospective narration. The past tense also occurs in third- person texts in the authorial heterodiegetic narration and in the figural mode. I am drawing the readers attention to the fact that in spite of the potential of retrospective narration (often signaled by the past tense) to provide distinctive markers for first person and third-person narrative situations, their differences cannot always be grounded on retrospective tense forms as a valid criteria. Cohn (1999: 97) may be cited to corroborate my argument here, especially her point of view that some first-person novels are written in the present tense from the first to the last page, a contrast she invokes to challenge and refute narrative rudiments that the only tense suitable for narration is the past tense.
considered as that of the speaking character can be identified in such a deictic marking as ‘now’. This explanation points to the clues to narration in the present tense but also to the opposition that underlies the narrative situation in the first and third persons when linked to tense category. The homodiegetic narrator can tell his experiences as he perceives or reflects on them. This mode of narration is often conceptualized as simultaneous narration. The heterodiegetic narrator can tell of the experiences of a character in a story as he perceives them with the possibility that perception, or viewing and telling are concurrent. The understanding intended here is that both retrospective and simultaneous narration constitute textual strategies to mark any given speaker or focalizer. The reader would realize that, while the past tense is used to report past events or perception retrieved from memory corresponding to the formal self, the present tense can be used to illustrate the ongoing process of action or perception in narration and in focalization. In that sense the present tense can be suitable for reporting events ongoing and for attributing voice to the narrating self, and perception to the experiencing self.

Another tense category for discussing narration aiming to attribute voice is the future tense systematized as prospective narration. A relevant device often recognized as convenient for marking a future narration include ‘will’ (Fleischman 1990: 31-41). The potential of this category to provide a distinctive and analytical clue is often transparent within the authorial (heterodiegetic) third person form, the only narrating agent upon which fiction allows the authority of omniscience or unrestricted knowledge. The issue of unrestricted authority of privilege and knowledge cognition allows the authorial heterodiegetic narrator access into the minds of fictive characters- he/she can also leap ahead in time to narrate in the future tense (a privilege categorically denied homodiegetic narrators who are often characters in action.

Tense categories can thus be considered important in analyzing the identity and functions of narrating agents in any given narrative text. Explicit references to the tense categories discussed above will help the study to meet its needs of analyzing the forms and functions of narration in the poetry under study.

---

188 Fleischman (1990: 39) also talks about the role of the future tense in introducing metannarative events into the story.
3. Focalization and Transgeneric Narratology: Strategies of Reference and Analysis

The aim of this section is to provide textual strategies for focalization. The strategies will be used in analysing Byron’s narrative poems in a bid to speak about the functions a given text may allow when the mode of narration is focalization. The question of what narrative strategies are likely to be introduced into a narrative text when the mode of mediation is construed as focalization may be answered by returning to the theoretical question ‘who sees’ (Genette 1980), extended by Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 79) and others to mean psychological, cognitive and ideological elements that create the impression of perceiving. In contrast to voice-defining features by which narratorial report is often identified, focalization refers to the non-verbal perceptions of the fictional world. It is often determined by the presence of ‘all perceptive, cognitive and emotional elements within the consciousness of the narrator or characters’, which may include processes such as thinking, feeling, remembering, and sensory perceptions. Any analyses of clues to focalization should begin with the question of which narrative level of communication the focalizer is located within a narrative text. The awareness triggered by such a statement is that focalization can be internal or external and thus needs to be differentiated. Rimmon-Kenan’s consideration for level also implies that a text can be focalized from an internal perspective involving the character or from an external perspective involving the narrator. Any discussion of focalization should consider the fact that its typologies are many and include: ‘external focalization’, ‘internal focalization’, ‘compound focalization’ and ‘collective focalization’. The range of typologies also implies that focalization enters a narrative text by different means depending on the level of the text on which the focalizer is located. One important factor to be considered in any discussion of focalization is the notion of the focalized object. The following discussion may shed light on what the study provides as innovative transgeneric narratological categories of analyzing focalization in poetic texts.

190 For the criteria of level as a factor for determining focalization see Rimmon-Kenan (1983).
191 This is Lanson’s (1992) terminology.
192 In the eyes of Rivara (2004: 87), Bal and Toolan have cautioned that focalization must involve an object that was perceived.
Psychoanalogies or metaphors can be relevant for analysing focalization in a bid to construct narrative and context meanings in Byron’s narrative texts. If focalization deals with processes that involve thinking, then imagery, which is a subconscious form of thinking, has a link with focalization. The point I am making is that one can think in imagery by means of imagistic associations. The act of making subconscious associations by means of imagistic patterns can only take place in the mind and involve remembering or thinking. Thinking has a relationship to focalization (and also consciousness) because it is an activity of focalization. It is thus possible to assume that the agent who associates things through imagery or engages in the mental activity of remembering is the one to whom perception (provide a choice of theme for narration) can be attributed. When one argues as such, one is drawing the reader’s attention to the narrative function of imagery or any form of psychoanalogy as a focalizing device. The device of psychoanalogy links mental activities to focalization in the sense that the narrator may use imagery (metaphor or simile) as a mirror through which the events and other character’s consciousness are rendered in a text.

In the analysis of consciousness strategies we argued that imagery can trigger an interpretation of a text as figural, and provide grounds for the construction of psychological characters in poetry. In the context of focalization, we would like to draw the reader’s attention to the analogous functions that psychoanalogies can perform beyond the interpretation of figural narration. Metaphors and similes are representations of psychoanalogies. In other words, a metaphor can be seen as one way mental life is textually manifested and thus its important component. Since a metaphor and simile enters the poetic text by means of subconscious associations, the role it can play in determining focalization can be demonstrated if the reader takes into consideration whether the act of subconscious associations originate in the mind of the authorial narrator or in a character’s. A narrator or character can use language or imagery in such a way that suggests his participation in the activity of imagining or thinking as a focalizer in the story. Seen as such a metaphor can be an important maker of focalization since the mind where psychic processes including subconscious associations often take place is also rendered by means of imagistic patterns or metaphorical analogies. Imagery which enters a given text by means of metaphor is thus apt to provide the reader an insight into the activity of cognition often associated with the imaginative mind. In this study therefore, imagery or metaphor will constitute the means by which the reader has access into the mind of the fictive individual engaged in subconscious association of things, and thus in the act of focalizing. Psychoanalogies as such have cognitive implications for the interpretation of focalization because the agent who does the
association is the one whose mind is at work in such a cognitive process. Bringing such an argument into this context implies that metaphor, a component of psychoanalogies feature a cognitive connection that is similar to what narrative theory recognizes as focalization. Although the emphasis offered by metaphor may be slightly different from cognitive frames of ‘seeing’, ‘viewing’, or ‘experiencing’ by which focalization is determined, psychoanalogies involve a process that is mental and subjective in nature and thus cannot be said to be divorced from perception or focalization in general. This implies that both the fictional character and narrator can think, perceive, or reflect in images. If the agent who thinks or perceives in images is the narrator, then focalization can be said to be external. On the other hand if the thinker or reflector is the story-internal character, then focalization would apparently be internal. Consequently, the orientation of narration would be attributed to the agent in question (by means of the perceptual device of imagery) or the fictive mind whose perceptions are conveyed. This implies that we meet narrative in mental actions such as metaphor associations. In this sense, any form of imagistic association will not only project the object, but also the thinking or perceiving agent, the values, perspective and subjective impressions of the agent doing the associations. The technique of psychoanalogy will be a productive device in terms of letting the reader see the uses that can be made of focalization in creating meaning in Byron’s poetry. To be specific, the device of psychoanalogy shall help the study to determine the the focalizer or source of experience, thought or even perception in any given text by paying attention to the subject of the metaphors of thinking and remembering. Psychoanalogies can also open up a new reconceptualization of narrative perspective in terms of an incorporation of mental-specific forms of meaning-making in the description and interpretation of narration and focalization. This is a view shared by Fludernik (2001: 101) when she calls for a radical redefinition of point of view in terms of ‘reorientation of focal perspective’.

Metaphors can do more than represent the textual mind and the focalizer since the mind of a particular community can enter the text by means of psychoanalogies. By implication, focalization is not only a question of whether the character or narrator focalizer sees or conceives or perceives an object, but also that of whose consciousness, point of view or perception the psychoanalogy is representing. Since metaphoric association is a mental activity, it can contribute to answer the question of whose perception, ideology or story a given text is constructing. This is where Lanser’s (1992: 15) category of collective consciousness or collective perspective understood to mean, a particular kind of narrative consciousness can be applicable in this study. Conceptualized in the words of Lanser as
collective consciousness, instances of metaphors will be used in this study to represent not just linguistic features but a particular kind of narrative consciousness or the perspective of a specific community and also a particular kind of fictive agent. The question of metaphorical analogy has a connection to Lanser’s typology in the sense that the mind of a particular community can be perceived in any given text through the mental activity of psychoanalogy that represent social and historical issues or even specific cultures. Seen in this light, psychoanalogical strategies that include similes and metaphors may become the narrative lens through which the reader can construct a focalizer, a narrative situation and level, a particular community, its values, beliefs, or even the ideologies of a particular literary culture.

The technique of memory or remembering may be a relevant strategy for constructing and attributing focalization in a narrative poem, specifically in homodiegetically narrated texts. We have argued earlier that memory is a tense indicator. Memory can also have further functions as a focalizing device especially in homodiegetic narration. Chatman (1986) and Cohn (1978: 151) have in different respects proposed the strategy of memory as a suitable marker for focalization. In a narratologically oriented attempt to separate story and discourse as a first step to differentiating narratorial voice (the narrating ‘I’) from the character focalizer (the experiencing ‘I’), Chatman (1986: 193ff.) proposes the cognitive indicator of memory as a suitable tool. Chatman (ibid. 193) convincingly argues especially with regards to homodiegetic narration that the narrating self of homodiegetic narration can reach its past self (the experiencing ‘I’) through memory:

A character can literally see (perceive, conceive, etc) what is happening in a story because he/she is in the story. A narrator can only ‘see it imaginatively, or in memory if he/she is homodiegetic i.e., participated in the events of the story ‘back then’ when they occurred.

In the case of a homodiegetically narrated text, Chatman argues on the importance of the memory device in attributing focalization to the narrating ‘I’. His argument can be


194 See Chatman (1986: 193) for an elaborate discussion on the distinction between narrator and character where he categorically denies the narrator the role of focalizing. Chatman appears to be concerned with using perception to make a difference between story and discourse. Earlier on, Genette (1980: 198-199) has argued that both the narrator and character can be focalizers, an argument convincingly sustained by Phelan (2001: 57; 58; 59) when he states that ‘as the narrator reports, the narrator cannot, help but simultaneously function as a set of lenses’. He goes further to say that the narrator cannot judge and make analogies without revealing his/her perceptions and thoughts. In the further analysis, Phelan argues that focalization works for homodiegetic narration, heterodiegetic narration, and also for ‘second person narration’ (1986: 58) which is typically focalized through ‘you’.

195 Cohn (1978: 151) provides an elaborate discussion on memory technique when used as a focalizing device. This is one of the ‘self narration-techniques’ that distances the experiencing self from the narrating self. The
explained in two respects. The experiencing ‘I’ or the character inhabited the story’s time-
and-space and ‘saw’ the events as the focalizer, in contrast to the homodiegetic narrating ‘I’ -
understood to mean the older and wiser or even the present moment narrator – who was never
in the fictional world and did not ‘see’ events and objects at an earlier moment in the story.
Logically therefore, the narrating self can only resort to retrospection by means of memory or
imagination to bring to the world of fiction what happened in the past.196 In arguing as such,
Chatman makes clear that the narrative strategy of memory or remembering can be an
important component of focalization, and can function to mark the narrating self as distinct
from the experiencing self. I will use the self narrating strategies of focalization to discuss the
forms by which focalization enters Byron’s narrative poems and perform narrative functions.

Drawing on Cohn’s (1978: 148-9; 151) elaborate discussion on consciousness
strategies, verbs that denote mental activities of perception may constitute markers for
analyzing the narrating self’s past consciousness and would equally serve as further signals of
self-narration as well as focalization. Any textual clues or mental vocabulary, the
psychological motivation, the past tense and the occasional ironic self-quotations are
theoretical evidence that denote the ‘cognitive privilege of the narrating over the experiencing
self’.197 The presence of the above mentioned devices will aid the study to find the narrating
agent who performs activities of focalization such as thinking or perceiving and thus make
conclusive etatements about the functions of focalization in any given poem.

Another crucial strategy by which focalization can be gauged and specified is called
free indirect discourse or narrated monologue (Cohn 1978). As said earlier, free indirect

196 Chatman’s (1986: 194) argument directs attention to what he himself recognises as ‘two separate beings
moving under the same identity ’ I’, namely-one, the narrator, who previously inhabited discourse-time-and-
space, and another, the character, who inhabited story time-and-space. The difference is crucial for our
understanding of focalization in homodiegetic texts. The character or ‘experiencing self’ saw or perceive the
events and therefore poses as the focalizer. On the other hand, the older self of the experiencing self at the
present moment of narration remembers and recounts those events, hence what the narrator expresses
appears, in Chatman’s conception to be only ‘memories of perceptions and conceptions internal to the story,
not the perceptions and conception internal to the story, not the perceptions and conceptions themselves’.

197 Prince (2001: 441) joins Chatman to argue that a narrator is never a focalizer, since he is never in the
fictional world and cannot perceive what the agents in the story perceive. To Prince however, the only
exception to the role is simultaneous narration. Prince is right. The narrator can remember and focalize at the
same time especially in present tense passages, an argument one adopts from Phelan (2001).
discourse is understood by Nünning/Nünning (2004: 125) to mean a narrative that ‘attempts to convey the illusion of offering an immediate insight into the perceptions and internal processes of a character’ in the character’s own language, and by Pascal (1977) and Toolan (2001 [1988]: 135) as ‘an ambiguous mixture of proper narrative and proper speech and thought’. The very term ‘thought’ is important for any analysis of focalization since thought itself cannot be said to be completely devoid of perception. In dealing with free indirect discourse as a marker of focalization and, by extension, one that can aid in determining a particular narrative situation and perspective in a given poem, pronouns for the third person singular, the past tense, loose syntax, signs of subjectivity by which a character’s thoughts and feelings may be reported (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 125), and the cognitive indicators of memory discussed earlier may be considered. In my earlier analysis I point out that in homodiegetic narration, the narrating ‘I’ can reach the past through memory (remembering). Since the future that cannot be perceived or foretold by the first-person narrator owing to his/her restrictions of cognition, conjecture and dream or fantasy can be used. It is clear from such an explanation that memory is a clue for the location of free indirect discourse and that it is a marker of focalization. Logically tenses, adverbs, narrative parameters for representing contemplation, subjectivity, imagination, or memory would make the mind, and thoughts by which it is reached a realm for remembered experiences of a perceptual type. Narrated memories or flashbacks often located in past tense signal can be used to determine perspective in the past (Cohn 1978: 128). Therefore, they play a crucial role in the analysis of reflector mode and for the attribution of perspective to the experiencing ‘I’ in homodiegetic narration. Cohn (1978: 130) argues that the grammar of the narrated monologue may anticipate the future often marked by a conditional tense especially for what she calls narrated fantasies.

The technique of internal focalization can be a relevant strategy for analysing the story internal character’s psychological or emotional involvement in a story (Jahn 2005: N1.18). Discussing focalization as a cognitive activity, Fludernik (1996: 345, 2001: 102) proposes forms of experiencing and viewing as cognitive clues for signaling the internal perspective (or reflector’s involvement in perception). Such analogous terms as consciousness, filters, internal perspective, or internal focalization, including makers provided by (Fludernik 2001: 103). Fludernik (1996) such as experiencing, viewing and subjectivity signals that create the impression of a focalizer are crucial for the attribution of perception to the story-internal character and for speaking about the functions of focalization in poetic texts.
As to the question of how tense functions as a relevant factor for the analysis of focalization in any given narrative poem, one needs to consider that a report of a past event is also a cognitive activity because the information is ‘filtered through and retrieved from memory’ (Fleischman 1990: 61). Memory clues are more explicit in first-person homodiegetic narration, which often branches into two distinct narrative situations under the same grammatical identity ‘I’: the narrating ‘I’ who reports from memory - and the experiencing ‘I’ (the past self of the homodiegetic narrator) who perceives events in the fictional world at the time as they occur (but which is now presented as a moment that corresponds to the past consciousness). Fleischman (1990: 61) underscores the point when she argues that a particular tense can be correlated with a particular mode of representation and with a particular activity carried out by the narrator - the narrating persona. Corroborating the argument that one entity perceives (the experiencing ‘I’) and the other remembers (the narrating ‘I’) she argues:

In verbal reports whose data source is perception the activities of seeing and speaking are carried out simultaneously, [...] via the PR tense, whose set of defining properties uniquely qualifies it for this task. In verbal reports whose source is memory, the narrative vehicle is approximately a tense of the PAST (observation/ experience occurs prior to speaking. (61)

And since one remembers in the past tense, the past psyche or reflections of the present self can only be reached by means of the past tense. The point I am making here is that when a narrator reports the past, he uses imagination, memory or other subjectivity markers that constitute perceptual clues and thus retain a link with focalization. Since it is the mental acts of imagination and memory that are emphasized and not verbal narration, the text is likely to contain psychological characters similar to those in modern prose fiction. It is this concern with psychological characters that link a text to modern prose fiction and create grounds for making conclusive statements about the functions of focalization in poetic texts.

The implication for the above analysis is that tense aspect is crucial for the analysis of focalization in the first person texts. Once we enter the context of first person narration, where the grammatical ‘I’ is shared by a narrator and his or her character-self, we are confronted with focalization shifts that involve the same ‘person’ (human and grammatical) (cf.

______________________________

198 See Chatman (1986) for this emphasis.

199 Fleischman (1990: 222) like Banfield (1982) contributes to explore the role of tense as the speaker/experiencing character indicator when she identifies two sentence types of narrative fiction arguing that they differ according to whether or not they contain an experiencing self at the moment corresponding to the act of consciousness.
Fleischman 1990: 222). As Fleischman (1990: 222) has convincingly argued in her analysis of the role of tense as focalization clues,

Whereas in third-person narration the contrast between the narrating discourse and the narrated discourse is formally supported by grammatical distinctions of person and tense (I-now vs. s/he-then), in first-person narration this contrast is more concealed, being no longer marked by distinctive pronouns.

The implication for such an argument is that, where grammatical distinctions of person have failed to account for focalization in first-person narration that carries two distinct identities, the ‘task of identifying the referent of the grammatical ‘I’ which splits into two (or more) subjectivities, depends on other linguistic signals, in particular tense-aspect categories’ (Fleischman 1990: 222). Note however that the experiencing narrator may also be present, in which case the speaker and experiencing narrator may coincide. Notice that there may be cases, as Fleischman’s analyses shows, when the temporality of the experiencing narrator may be past, in which case the gap between the speaker and experiencing narrator remains wide. Such tense forms as then and now may reveal the different time references and may help the reader identify cases where there is coincidence of speaking and experiencing narrators. Logically, the contrast within the first-person voice between speaker and experiencing narrator, between the focalization of the narrating ‘I’ and that of the experiencing ‘I’, would find linguistic expression in this study through tenses (cf. Fleischman 1990: 225). Deitic adverbs and other tense forms will be useful in analyzing narrative poems that construct focalization. Adopting Toolan’s (2001 [1988]: 59) point of view, I argue that any attempt to interpret non-individuating texts that resists any specification of perspective should rely on deictics. In suggesting that deictics can determine focalization in any given text, Toolan (2001 [1988]: 59) cites clues such as ‘I’ and ‘you’, yesterday, today and tomorrow, tense choices, contrastive adverbs and adjectives and says the forms may create the illusion that discourse originates from a particular speaker in a particular place at a particular time. Deitic expressions such as this, now and here will be relevant for my analysis of how focalization is used in Byron’s poetry since they can provide information about the speaker, the perceiver of events and his/her perspective and functions.

My conclusion concerning textual indicators for focalization is that reading a narrative poem in the light of focalization may be a starting point for discussing the narrative features Byron’s poetry makes available for constructing narrative and other meanings. From the various categories of voice and focalization by which Byron’s verse can interrelate with narrative tradition and cultural issues, an innovative narratologically transgeneric theory of
poetry can be evolved. Readers can therefore analyze communication in poetry with the help of the above categories. By introducing the concepts of figural narration, the first-person autobiographical forms and self narrating strategies, authorial narratorial voice, perspective structure, narratee devices, communal voice, metanarrative elements and tense forms into transgeneric narratology, the interdisciplinary dimension of the study can be assessed. By providing consciousness representation strategies as well as forms of focalization for a transgeneric narrative-oriented reading of poetic texts, the study is also paying attention to both the ways Byron’s poetry can construct narrative, and also to the peculiarities of Byron’s narrative verse. To conclude, forms of narration and focalization that can be constructed from Byron’s poetry will thus become important factors in the construction of the relationship transgeneric narrative theory shares with contexts and, consequently in the analysis of narration and focalization in Byron’s poetry.
III. AN ANALYSIS OF THE USES OF CERTAIN CATEGORIES OF NARRATORS IN BYRON’S NARRATIVE VERSE

‘Every utterance in a natural language has an origin: an utterer, placed in a given situation [...]. The utterance bears the marks of its origin: [...]. The act of utterance, in so far as it is known to the addressee, can determine who the utterer is [...].

Rivara (2004: 92)

Narratorial voice and techniques for the representation of consciousness - conceptionalized in the study under the typology of mediacy - constitute some of the central conceptual factors in transgeneric narrative theory that may prove their potential in meeting the study’s aim of first, making narratology function in poetry analysis, and second, establishing a link between narratology and contexts (social and ideological). Narratorial voice and the techniques for the representation of consciousness have concerned both classical and the new post-classical theories dealing with narrative communication and mediation. Since poetry has affinities with the narrative (prose) tradition at the level of story telling and mediation, it can benefit from a range of analytical categories that apply to narrative genres and that are also apt to come to terms with issues of contexts. The categories of mediation that will be used for analysis represent a body of critical interventions analyzed in the study in the innovative blend called transgeneric narratology.200 In poetry as well as in narrative fiction in general, the concept of mediacy which subsumes forms of narratorial voice and strategies for the representation of consciousness has often been invoked to provide a theoretical basis for the analysis of different types of narrators. Conceptualized as ‘who speaks?’ (Genette 1980), to differentiate voice from focalization (who sees?), narration in narratology in general, as in this study is best illustrated by both voice and strategies for representing consciousness - what Fludernik (1996: 345) describes as TELLING AND ACTION – orientation frames. Although the question of ‘who speaks?’ that is often linked to narration logically excludes consciousness representation strategies often assigned to the figural narrative situation, I will consider this concept because narration includes the textual, contextual, and mental devices that suggest the presence of ‘a  

200 Hühn (2004) has been cited in this line of thinking. In addition, critics have often distinguished narrative (prose) fiction and narrative poetry from drama, lyric and film in the sense that the first category tell stories through ‘voice’ forms while in the second, the characters often speak directly. I use ‘voice’ here as a concept that locates poetry in a d generally reserved for narrative (prose) fiction.
speaker or reflector function […]’ (Fludernik 1996: 344). In attempt to analyse narration in Byron’s poetry, I will rely on the manner in which the mediating entities designated to tell the stories narrate events. Variegated concepts for answering questions dealing with narrative mediation have been developed both within narratology, and in areas outside the immediate aims and methodological agenda of narratology one of which is cultural history\(^\text{201}\). How narration is used in Byron’s poetry is directly linked to how utterance signified by linguistic devices constructs speakers, thinkers, cultural history and contexts. It is both the question of how formal features of Byron’s narrative poetry represent the voice and perspective of post colonial communities or institutions (like slavery, subjects, subjectivity, power and law) as well construct narratorial voice. The question of how narration is used in Byron’s poetry will find answers in this chapter by means of representations in which narratorial voice, consciousness strategies and perspective play central roles. An explanation of the innovative transgeneric model that incorporates available theoretical concepts for discussing mediation and functions of narration in the construction of meaning in poetry is required as a first step.

In view of the theoretical imperatives foregrounded in the theory chapter, the question of which strategies may trigger the illusion of narration, and the question as to the role of narration in enhancing the impression of the link between narrative theory and culture can be answered if the reader takes into consideration the linguistic devices including voice and consciousness representation strategies often made available when narration, cultural history and context/ideological issues enter a given text. To reiterate my point, categories of narratorial voice and forms for the representation of thought may constitute parameters for coming to terms with narration and are provided by the transgeneric narrative theory of poetry. Narrative categories of mediation are prioritized and chosen to meet the study’s goals, bearing in mind that they may create the illusion of linguistic devices-voice and forms for the representation of thought as travelling concepts (those that are flexible and can solve problems in different research disciplines with similar presuppositions), aiming also to show certain ways voice and thought patterns may be discussed as a common theoretical interest where research areas with parallel agendas intersect. A reliance on the way linguistic devices are used in a given text would be a reliable parameter for constructing narratorial voice and

\(^{201}\) Ansgar Nünning (2000) discusses the link between narratology and cultural history, using as one form where such an interlink may be made manifest perspective structure which subsumes narrators, characters, and focalizers. This study carries Ansgar Nünning’s proposal forward pointing out that feminist narratology conceptualizes voice under issues of identity, authority, and one may add subjects, and power but which are linked to specific ways certain communities, their values and believes are represented. One of such forms is communal voice.
specific cultural contexts such as post colonial subjects since the construction of these important areas of transgeneric narratology cannot take place independent of consideration for formal devices a given text constructs. Since the construction of narration is based on concepts for discussing levels within narrative communication, the reader’s attention needs to be geared towards categories of narrators proposed for analysing narration in this study. The first category is the first-person narrator or homodiegetic narrator in Genette’s (1980) conception understood in narrative theory to mean a narrator who is also a character in the story and therefore located on the plot. The authorial narrator (Stanzel’s terminology, in Nünning/Nünning’s opinion (2004: 111) which corresponds to Genette’s heterodiegetic narrator) in contradistinction to the first-person narrator is never a character in the story but is located outside the story in discourse. Authorial narration is characterized by the dominance of the external perspective. He/she is endowed with omniscience or unrestricted knowledge and will constitute another way of investigating the forms and functions of narration in Byron’s poetry. A third category of narrative situation which this study proposes to deploy in a bid to answer questions dealing with narration is the type introduced by Stanzel and modified by Cohn (1978), Jahn (2005) and others called the figural mode. This type features in the story, not as tellers (that characterize first-person homodiegetic narrators, the narrating ‘I’, and third-person heterodiegetic narrative situations), but as reflectors because, instead of telling, the reader has direct access into the perceptions, mind, feelings, fantasies, emotions, thoughts, memories, dreams or internal states of the character who is the central consciousness. Another often unacknowledged, and as yet, unsystematized voice category that is useful for my discussion is described in this study as narrating objects and I used the term specifically for those animals which can be transformed into diegetic subjects by means of a linguistic feature and accorded narratorial voice. A further voice category that will be instrumental in my discussion of the uses that can be made of Byron’s narrative techniques aiming to address the link between narratology and cultural and ideological issues is called communal voice. For want of a better systematized term, I adopt Lanser’s (1992: 21) concept called ‘communal voice’, because it describes a mode of narrative practice ‘in which narrative authority is invested in a definable community and textually inscribed either through multiple, mutually authorizing voices or through the voice of a single individual who is manifestly authorized by a community.’ The animal image in Byron’s poetry has a narrative authority because it is represented in form of ‘we’. Because the animals are ascribed narrative authority just like any given narrator, they appear to speak for a community of the voiceless and incarcerated and would thus be employed as a voice category to forge a link between
narratology and culture (which deals, among other things, with the ways context-specific issues are represented in narrative). The above narrative categories are constructed in Byron’s narrative verse. Since our working concept is mediacy, we will also consider under the different voice categories or strategies by which narratives produce poetic meaning and leave behind decisive specific traces. After pointing out a number of relevant categories that I consider as some of the specific replicas of narration that can be useful for both textual and contextual construction of narrative meaning, interpretation and analysis of narrators, I find it expedient to announce the aims of this chapter.

The guiding thesis of the study – to develop a new conceptualization of transgeneric narrative theory of poetry aiming to provide narrative tools that are both structural/linguistic and culturally oriented to analyzing narrative structures and their functions in Byron’s narrative poetry will be sustained in the first part of this chapter by focusing on the uses of signals for the location of authorial narration in Byron’s poetry. Some of the strategies including metanarrative commentaries, personal interjections, thematizing, generalizing, and moral judgements on events, reader address signals, flashforwards, covert/overt markers, omniscience and omnipresent indicators, mental verbs including vocabulary that indicate evidence of spatial and psychological privilege of insight ‘into the internal processes of all characters and familiarity with their thoughts and feelings’ (Nünning/Nünning (2004: 113), psychoanalogies and so on will be applied to interpret and analyze poems constructed in the authorial mode. Part II of the chapter, whose central agenda consists of making the category of the first-person narrator function as interpretive, differential and analytical device in poetry, will consider categories and strategies to analyze the first-person narratorial voice. Voice forms, grammatical signals, mental clues, perspective, overt signals, narrating objects/communal voice, self-narration strategies, tense aspects, unreliability, and other strategies that may encourage a reading of a poem as first-person will be considered here. Part III seeks to answer the question of which strategies of analysis are made available when forms of consciousness subsumed under figural or reflector mode enter Byron’s narrative poems. The chapter tries to answer this question by focussing on the transgeneric narratological categories and strategies (hitherto unemphasized in poetic criticism) such as interior monologues,202 narrated monologue (free indirect discourse), psychonarration,

202 I am not using interior monologue here as a sub-genre as Cohn emphasized in Transparent Minds: Narrative Moods for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction (1978). I am using it as a technique, as Cohn also points out when she links it to the first-person narrative. Rimmon-Kenan (1992: 102) has remarked that ‘As a technique, the interior monologue can appear within the context of either a third-person or a first-person narrative’.
psychoanalyses, memory devices, and mental verbs/vocabulary in general. The above strategies are intended to provide innovative areas of research in transgeneric narratology, to anchor productive ways of speaking about narration in Byron’s poetry and by extension the relationship between poetry and cultural history/ideologies. They also constitute the study’s attempt to bridge the gap created by both Hühn’s (2004) transgeneric narratology as well as early critical analysis on Byron’s poetry considering the apparent lack of concern for certain forms of narration indicated above.

The narrative poems selected as a testing ground for my model are mostly those in which issues of narration and contexts are textually manifest or articulated through narrative forms described above. In addition, these narrative poems were written in the Romantic literary period (1789-1823) but are chosen because they display affinities with narrative (prose) fiction in their incorporation of elements of mediation and thus provide grounds to sustain my hypotheses that Byron’s poetry constructs both narrative and contexts through narrative means. They may thus be located in the historical contexts of postcolonialism, romanticism, and also in the 18th and 19th century novelistic traditions of telling stories in the manner of ‘narratives of autobiography’ (Ansgar Nünning 2000) and fictional narratives. One needs to point out, however, that as opposed to the traditional novel on which Byron largely drew, there exist categories of narration similar to the 20th-century modernist narrative aesthetics. To borrow Allrath’s (2005) phrase in a different context, Byron’s narrative poetics is one that is not restricted by a reliance on any specific literary tradition and historical context, but rather by an engagement with narrative elements often associated with the postcolonial, the romantic, the traditional and the modern novel, which narratology has also explored. Nonetheless, the variety of ways in which he experimented with narrative evidenced in his use of agents and moods of mediation is responsible for the fundamental discrepancies in his narrative style. Before we turn to analysis, an explanation on the lack of emphasis on the role of mediacy (narration) as a conceptual and analytical category in Byron’s poetry is necessary.

Adopting Cohn, whom Rimmon-Kenan also quotes in the same text, three modes for rendering consciousness in the context of third-person texts which constitutes psychonarration, quoted monologue (interior monologues), and narrated monologue (free indirect discourse) have been proposed. Still in the light of Cohn’s thinking, Rimmon-Kenan identified three analogous techniques within the first-person context self narration, self-quoted monologue and self narrated monologue.

See Kroeger’s (1969: 103; 104) description of “Don Juan” as a novel in verse, a ‘precursor of a new kind of novel writing which begins in an 18th-century manner and only gradually becomes an anticipation of nineteenth century fiction’.
Despite the variety of ways in which Byron experimented with narrative, one of which is story telling, conceptualized here under concepts of voice and consciousness representation strategies it is regrettable how critics concerned with discussing Byron’s narrative verse have apparently ignored the uses that can be made of narration. That existing studies on Byron’s poetry rarely engage the question of how narratological terminology of mediacy of narration can be useful in analysis can only be justified when one pays attention to extant literature on Byron’s poetry specifically those studies that have engaged with questions of narration in the poetry under study. Regrettably, those dealing directly with the analysis of narrators have failed to ground their discussions with concepts by which narrators can be identified, differentiated, interpreted, and analyzed as a basis for speaking about their functions in constructing narrative and cultural meanings. Most studies analyzing agents of narrative transmission in Byron’s narrative poetry have often rested on either Byron as narrator or focus on the Byronic hero, or even on the different appearances the poet persona assume in the said poetry. Francis Doherty’s (1968: 58) examination of Byron’s ‘verse tales’ such as “The Corsair”, “Lara” “The Bride of Abydos” “The Giaour” “The Siege of Corinth” and “Parisina” has left him with the biographically grounded conclusion that they are fictional biographies, representing the various ways Byron lived his life.

A. B. England (1975: 150) examines the narrator of “Don Juan” but his engagement with the ways the narrator negotiates his narration is restricted to devices he conceives as narratorial commentary, author signals, digression, actions, and reflections. In his opinion, these techniques are some ways ‘that bring the reader into closer contact with the mind of the narrator’. One can also cite a similar interpretation from John Jump (1973a: 111), who rightly acknowledges the presence of ‘plain narration’ in “Don Juan” although he seems to confuse the authorial narrator of the poem with the author:

> To refer at last not to ‘the monologists’ or the narrator, but to Byron himself brings a considerable feeling of relief [...] As a matter of biographical fact, Byron evidently thought of himself as speaking with his own voice in “Don Juan” [...] As a matter of literary fact, nothing
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204 See literature review in the introductory section for more on the lack of studies focussing on narration or mediation in general in Byron’s poetry. See England (1975). See also M. K. Joseph (1966: 197; 200) in his fundamental comment that ‘Byron’ achieves complete dissociation from his hero in “Don Juan”, ‘by the device of the narrator’ although he later on, and inappropriately conflates the hero with the narrator in his claim that Byron (the poet) is the ‘narrator, mediating between the poem and reader’. See also another victim of such an interpretation, Jump (1972: 115) who interprets narrative stanzas in “Don Juan” with the conclusion that “Don Juan”, (‘single monologue long enough to fill half-a-dozen of Shakespeare plays’) is told by Byron.
in “Don Juan” encourages us to discern an authorial point of view differing from that of the narrator, or digressor [...].

To give weight to his claims that the voice we hear in “Don Juan” is that of Byron, Jump (111) cites as evidence the story-teller or Byron who professes 'to have been a friend of Juan’s parent’s and, capitalizing on the use of grammatical ‘I’, he concludes: ‘This is a voice that defines him sharply and leaves him in sole command of the poem, and it is surely the voice of Byron himself [...]’. When one considers that the six major adventures of the hero, which Jump himself quotes are told in third-person reference by an external voice that puts his hero in action or the plot, one begins to wonder at Jump’s conclusions. Nonetheless, such an interpretation plays a role in this study since it exists as evidence of the differences between this study and earlier attempts focussing on the uses of narration in the analysis of Byron’s poetry.

Jane Kirchner’s elaborate study of Byron’s narrative verse focuses on an examination of the various identities assumed by the narrative persona. Her analytical categories include the poet persona, the Byronic hero, and the narrator. The few studies discussed above reveal a disregard for the interdisplinary orientation and typological scope of categories of narrators proposed by this project for raising and answering questions of narration and contexts in Byron’s poetry. The present endeavor serves as an attempt at first, identifying the gaps created by critics of Byron’s poetry, particularly those that engage with questions of narration (either partially or fully); and second, making available a systematic and synthesized range of categories of narrators for analyzing this almost neglected aspect of Byron’s poetry. I find it expedient to use Byron’s narrative poetry as a testing ground for transgeneric narrative theory of mediation. In what follows, I will analyse the ways in which narration and its analytical categories can be made to perform functions in Byron’s poetry.
1. The Uses of Authorial Narration in Poetry Analysis

Any attempt to stage authorial narration in Byron’s poetry needs to take into consideration both personalized and depersonalized references conceptualized as covert/overt forms. To approach the question of how narration is used in Byron’s poetry also entails taking into consideration the presence of covert (Chatman 1978) signals that create the impression of narrators who tell the story of other characters in the third-person. In other words, if one goes by Mieke Bal’s (1985: 121-122) argument that ‘as soon as there is language, there is a speaker who writes it, as soon as those linguistic utterances constitute a narrative text, there is a narrator, a narrating subject,’ then there is no doubt that the depersonalized (covert) narrators one finds in “Parisina”, “The Corsair” “Prometheus”, “The Waltz”, and “Lara” are indubitable evidence of the presence of an authorial heterodiegetic narrator interpreting events from a position external to the diegetic level of the story.

Depersonalized references, understood to mean the narrating agent is not named can be important for marking authorial narration. My first illustrative example of how a depersonalized narrator can assume the role of be transmitter of information about the constituent parts of the narrated world (‘i.e., time, place, characters, and action’ (Nünning /Nünning 2004: 120) and thus leaves traces of authorial voice and functions is from “Lara”, narrated in two long cantos. In one of the texts, narration begins in a typically covert manner:

A:  And Lara left in youth his fatherland;
But from the hour he waved his parting hand
Each trace wax’d fainter of his course, till all
Had nearly ceased his memory to recall.
His sire was dust, his vassals could declare,
‘Twas all they knew, that Lara was not there;
Nor sent, nor came he, till conjecture grew
Cold in the many, anxious in the few.
His hall scarce echoes with his wonted name,
[…]

(Byron, “Lara” I; III)

B:  ‘Twas midnight—all was slumber; the lone night
Dimm’d in the lamp, as loth to break the night.
Hark! there be murmurs heard in Lara’s hall—
A sound — a voice—a shriek—a fearful call!
A long, loud shriek—and silence—did they hear
That frantic echo burst the sleeping ear?
They heard and rose, and, tremulously brave,
Rush where the sound invoked their aid to save;
They come with half-lit tapers in their hands,
And snatch’d in startled haste unbelted brands.

(Byron, “Lara” I; XII)
These passages focusing on Lara’s self exile, return and convulsive dream are relayed by an external narrator who does not make him/herself known by means of personal references. Such a remark is in consonant with narratological descriptions of covert narration. The first stanza starts off in a typically depersonalized omniscient mode (heterodiegetic) of authorial narration focusing variously on Lara’s self exile and the anxiety in people about Lara. Narration is retrospective and this claim is supported by action words that convey the past activities of Lara before self exile, and knowledge clues in such forms as ‘left’, ‘waved’, ‘was’, ‘knew’, ‘sent’ and ‘came’. In narrating covertly, the authorial narrator in a typically omniscient style reveals what Lara’s family relations knew, thought and disclosed about the former including their anxiety: ‘His sire was dust, /’Twas all they knew/anxious in a few’ (I: III). Verbs like ‘conjecture’, ‘knew’, and ‘hear’ (I: XII) suggest mental activities in the innerworld of characters and are also evidenced that the covert authorial narrator has an insight into the the minds of story internal characters and can tell about their thoughts and level of knowledge. In the second stanza focusing on Lara’s convulsive dream and the people’s feelings and reactions, what the reader finds is covert narration supported by a profusion of action verbs (‘hear’, ‘rush’, ‘heard’) in sentences like ‘Twas midnight-all was slumber. / A long, loud shriek-and silence-did they hear / They heard and rose, and, tremulously brave, / Rush where the sound invoke the aid to save’ with no linguistically discernible narrating agent. What one notices is the sheer absence of any personalized references to the narrator in action and psychic-oriented sentences such as ‘Lara left’, ’Twas all they knew’, ‘They heard and rose’ and ‘And snatch’d in startled haste’. In the further Canto’s of the poem, the narrator takes the reader to the fight scene, where Lara’s challenger Otto fights for Ezzelin who is absent; events are still reported from a position outside the narrated world. In further examples, long narrated passages about Ezzelin’s unexpected disappearance give no evidence of a narrating agent. (“Lara” II; VI) The passages about rumor implicating Lara as a murderess (“Lara” II; VII) are also narrated in yet covert manner. In the passage that recounts Lara’s silent contemplation of revenge (“Lara” II, VIII), and finally the climax where the narrator follows the main character to the battle ground, recounting in the present tense Lara’s active involvement in battle, his fatal wound and death (“Lara” II; XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, and XXI), narration is still devoid of an explicit voice. In this narrative Canto, the identity of the narrator is undisclosed, a factor that may also be misleading in any attempt to attribute voice or identifying the teller of any given text. Nonetheless, the covertness is also relevant for the way authorial narration enters the poem. I
am drawing the reader’s attention to the fact that covert markers suggest an external position. The functions the covert narrator performs range from neutral transmission of information about Lara and his people to disclosing the time of events. The fact the narrator is able to move forward and backward in time signified by past and present tense references coupled with his/her ability to be in the minds of many story characters simultaneously (conveyed in the phrases ‘conjecture grew’ / ‘cold in the many, anxious in the few’) gives room for discovering spatial and cognitive advantages unique to authorial narration but hardly noticeable in first person texts. The covert strategy may thus constitute one important way of constructing an authorial narrator and of speaking about his/her functions as a narrative device.

Another example in which events are described from the point of view of an impersonal narrator and which is relevant for an interpretation of a poem as authorial occurs in the narrator of “Lara”’s description of events at a social gathering (“Lara” I; XX, XXI). The first indicator that the text is covert and authorial is that all action and psychic verbs or phrases that orientate narration do not reveal any evidence of an explicit voice. For instance, in his/her characteristically covert style, the narrator reports that ‘To Otto’s hall came Lara’. In another example, the narrator takes the reader into Lara’s mind to describe his emotions and state of mind as conveyed in the phrase ‘And Lara gazed on these, sedately glad’. In these two examples, the reader notices that the narrator is not named and remains in a position outside the story. It is Lara who is placed in action-sentences and not the narrator who sees things from a position outside the story. In passages I, XX and XXI, the reader notices that it is not the covert narrator’s actions that play a central role in the story. It is the actions and feelings of Lara that permit the plot to evolve. It is the perceptual action of Lara conveyed in ‘gazed’ or his state of mind (as he leans against a pillar observing, and ‘glanc[ing]’ at someone critically observing him) that is emphasized. The fact that the narrator is not linguistically named and that he tells about experiences and actions performed by other people are already indications of one way covert narrators manifest themselves textually.

Further examples of covertly narrated texts that may draw the reader’s attention to narration as authorial feature in “Parisina”, “The Corsair”, “Prometheus”, “The Waltz”, and “The Siege of Corinth”. The narrative of these poems are for the most part transmitted neutrally in the manner described by Nünning/Nünning (2004: 119-120) as ‘anonymous voices, about which the readers are given no information.’ In different degrees of emphasis,
these poems feature narratives of events, both physical and psychic, about other character(s) from depersonalized voices, who are not participants in the story events.

Beginning with “Parisina”, the authorial narrator narrates from a position external to the story. The following example about Parisina’s guilt in relation to the sexual act with Hugo provides evidence that narration is covert, and controlled by an external narrator:

With many a lingering look they leave
The spot of guilty gladness past;
And though they hope, and vow, they grieve,
As if that parting were the last.
The frequent sigh-the long embrace-
The lip that there would cling for ever,
While gleams on Parisina’s face
The heavens she fears will not forgive her
[…].

(Byron, “Parisina” IV)

No evidence reveals that the narrator is named. Psychic processes that orientate the narration are conveyed in the verbs ‘hope’, ‘grieve’, and word ‘fears’ (inwardly performed in the minds of Hugo and Parisina) suggest that it is their point of view that is emphasized. Such evidence not only removes the narrator from the plot, but allows for conclusive statements that narration is controlled by an external narrator who is not named. In the poem, the main events of the plot - consisting of incest involving Hugo (the bastard but disgruntled son of Azo) and Parisina, Azo’s wife, the discovery, the court scene judgement and punishment by murder - are told by a narrator who is not named, but who puts the protagonist (Hugo) and other characters in action-oriented characters using third-person references. This kind of narration in which the narrator is external and depersonalized but knows and tells about events reveals the extent to which Byron’s narrative verse provides strategies for constructing what is recognized in narratology as authorial narration.

Although we have argued above that narration in the authorial form can be signalled by covert markers, it is also true that personalized references can play a role in the analysis of narration as authorial, and consequently in the construction of meaning. Authorial narration in “Don Juan” and elsewhere can also be signalled by personalized references. Corroborating clues that narration in “Don Juan” (in the third-person) is signaled by personalized references in the ‘I’ and ‘we’ forms scattered all over the sixteen cantos of the poem exist. If readers buy into classical definitions that authorial narrative situation in the third-person is marked by ‘I’,
and ‘we’ forms, then the profusion of these linguistic signals may be important for identifying, differentiating and analyzing Byron’s poems in the third-person. The reader is invited to take note of the following passages of the poem which contain personalized traits that may reinforce the impression that the authorial narrator of “Don Juan” makes him/herself known by means of explicit references:

And that still keeping up the old connection,
Which time had lately render’d much more chaste,
She took his lady also in affection,
And certainly this course was much the best:
She flatter’d Julia with her sage protection,
And complimented Don Alphonso’s taste;
As if she could not (who can?) silence scandal,
At last she left it a more slender handle.

I can’t tell whether Julia saw the affair
With other people’s eyes, or if her own
[…]
I am really puzzled what to think or say […].

(Byron, “Don Juan” I; LXVII, LXVIII)

In the first example taken from “Don Juan”, the authorial narrator tells the story of Juan’s seduction by Gulbeyaz in such a manner that his voice is discerned in the linguistic reference such as ‘I’. In the further example from the same poem, the narrator characterizes his narration as the teller of the story of seduction by means of the ‘We’ and also ‘I’ personalised references: ‘We left our hero and third heroine in/A kind of state more awkward than uncommon’ (“Don Juan” VI; VII); ‘I know Gulbeyaz was extremely wrong;/I own it, I deplore it’; (“Don Juan” VI; VIII); ‘Gulbeyaz was the fourth, and (as I said)’ (“Don Juan” VI; XII). The story external character is named ‘I’. The first impression the reader may get is that the narrator is a character in the story (homodiegetic) especially in such passages in which he characterizes himself in the first-person reference ‘I’. But when the reader realizes that the narrator is completely removed from all verbs of action (or from the fictional world) on which the plot evolves, and that he/she is telling the story of other people, the confusion created by the ‘I’, and ‘we’ references is minimized, thus serving to reveal the narrator’s position as external. Because the narrator is overtly identified, his functions range from narrating to offering commentary on his narration (‘She took his lady also in affection/And certainly this course was much the best/And if she could not (who can?) silence the scandal’), judging the
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205 One may argue that a personalized reference as ‘I’ is sometimes confusing. In “Don Juan” and “Lara”, authorial narrators refer to themselves as ‘I’ and ‘we’, just like what is common with first-person narrative. Less confusing terms such as homodiegetic narration and heterodiegetic narration are however used to designate narrators who double as characters within the story and those who narrate from a position outside the story respectively.
character’s actions, motives and condemning them when such actions are apparently unconventional. The narrator’s claim that he is recounting the event concerning a hero and a third heroine conveyed in the phrase ‘we left our hero […] in a kind of […] (uncommon)’ also serves to emphasize his ability to follow the story characters where there is action, and reports events, and their actions. In addition to the ‘I’ textual signal, the reader realizes that the narrating cantos of “Don Juan” are marked by what Lanser (1992) describes as extra textual frames of reference which play a crucial role in marking narration as heterodiegetic. In the fragments quoted above, and others, the heterodiegetic narrator does not only restrict his functions to telling. He provides comments about the moral and psychological factors about Juan’s mother, and the kind of education and religious upbringing she intended for Juan.

Another example where the authorial narrator comes out obtrusively and which is important in locating utterance to an identified authorial narrator occurs at the beginning of “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” when the narrator tells about his knowledge of Harold’s ancestry: ‘Childe Harold was he high: but whence his name/And lineage long, it suits me not to say (I, I; III). The external narrator is textually identified as ‘me’. The presence of the personalized reference conveyed by ‘me’, and the fact that the narrator is completely absent from every verb of action has significant effects in analyzing narration as external and authorial. In the examples just cited above, the narrator performs a crucial function such as giving expository information about Juan’s ancestry. In the example from “Don Juan” relaying the story of seduction, the narrator passes his judgement on seduction as unconventional. Personalized references mentioned above can determine heterodiegetic narration, and also the functions to be expected when the narrator is an explicit agent.

That mental verbs and mind states in general (psychological vocabulary) conceptualized in this study as psychonarration can be important interpretive, differential and analytical tools for rendering authorial voice, and by extension the role Byron’s narrative verse plays in construction narrative and context meanings can be illustrated with passages from Byron’s narrative poems. Features that suggest psychic processes and states of mind have an important function for the analysis of a text as authorial heterodiegetic. If, in a narrative statement, the narrator gives the impression that he/she has access into the emotions, knowledge, dispositions, feelings, thoughts (of a character); or make remarks about what the character knows or does not know, then narration can be said to be authorial since mind forms cited above are markers of omniscience which is a component of authorial narration. In my analysis of “Lara”, and ”Don Juan” amongst others, signals for mind states (psychonarration)
function first, as signs of self-reference for the narrator who has an insight into the ways the mind functions and describes these states of mind, and second as clues for constructing a narrative situation. Such forms constitute verbs or phrases that suggest states of minds such as emotions, knowledge, feelings, dispositions, and a character’s level of awareness among others. Verbs that suggest omniscience or cognitive privilege as well as psychoanalologies will also be considered. My first illustrative example of how mental vocabulary can encourage an impression of a text as authorial, and leave traces for a forging of narrative functions comes from “Lara” in which an impersonalized narrator describes the events at a social gathering. The following sentences are those that contain psychological vocabulary and permit an understanding of the role of omniscience signals in describing narration as authorial:

There is a festival, where knights and dames,
And aught that wealth or lofty lineage claims,
[…]
And Lara gazed on these sedately glad;
[…]
At length he caught it, ’tis a face unknown,
But seems as searching his, and his alone;
Prying and dark, a stranger’s by his mien,
Who still till now had gazed on him unseen:
At length encountering meets the mutual gaze
Of keen inquiry and of mute amaz’e.
[…].

(Byron, “Lara” I; XX, XXI)

In the above lines, one notices that it is the state of mind of Lara that is emphasized by means of mental verbs which are already indications of the presence of authorial unrestricted privilege of insight into other minds. In the phrase ‘And Lara gazed on these sedately glad’ Lara’s emotions of joy are conveyed by the mental verb such as ‘gazed’ and the adjective ‘glad’. The adjective ‘glad’ which by definition suggests a state of joy is a psychic process. Since only authorial narrators are accredited cognitive privilege, the adjective can be a sign of the speaker who knows the Lara’s state of mind and attempts to provide descriptions by transposing the character’s emotions into mental words that express the very emotional process. Even though it is the emotions and feelings of Lara that are expressed in the word ‘glad’, one may also argue that it is through the mental adjective that the authorial narrator who has the potential of understanding how Lara feels makes him/herself known. In addition the description of one of the men observing Lara in such an adjective as ‘sternly’ projects a tone of judgement- which of course is that of Lara’s opponent in the words of the authorial narrator. While such verbs and adjectives may help the reader locate the impersonalized voice
of the discourse as external, and that of the authorial narrator, they also shed light on the narrator’s role of narrating and characterizing story internal characters.

In another passage from “Don Juan” (I; L IV) recounting Juan’s upbringing, traces of indirect discourse and of authorial narration are revealed in the profusion of verbs of cognition in sentences such as ‘his mother deem’d/Him almost a man/she flew in rage’. By means of such a mental verb like ‘deem’d’ and adjective like ‘rage’, the narrator of the poem repeatedly engages in reporting Juan’s mother’s state of mind and emotions respectively. An adjective or verb that suggests a state of mind, thoughts or attempts to represent consciousness can be important for narration as authorial—the only narrating agent with authority of knowledge and cognition. The same technique for rendering a character’s state of mind is evident in the narrator’s report in many fragments of “Don Juan” quoted above.

When, in the passage describing Gulbayez’s apparent embarrassment at Juan’s emotional behaviour the reader reads: ‘She was a good deal shock’d’, (see also the description of Juan’s mother’s wishes), the emotional event conveyed in ‘shock’d’, reveals Gulbayez’s state of mind and provides information about Gulbayez’s startling (violent) sensations and agitating emotional feelings. In the reports, there are traces of omniscience in ‘his mother deem’d/Him almost a man/she flew in rage’/ ‘She was a good deal shock’d”; because ‘deemed’ and ‘shocked’ for instance, provide the narrator's knowledge of the states of mind of Juan’s mother and Gulbayez; what Cohn (1978) conceptualizes as psychonarration is noticed. While psychonarration is particularly a useful parameter for describing the subjectivities of the characters whose feelings and emotions the external voice is projecting, its strategies are further corroborative evidence of omniscient knowledge, and can therefore account for the extent to which Byron’s poetry can create a narrative situation as well as provide parameters for writing an authorial narrative.

In “Lara”, (I: XIII) for instance, the narrator is external to the plot and telling is both retrospective and simultaneous employing psychonarration. Lara’s exile and convulsive dream are both recounted in the past tense: ‘And Lara left in Youth his fatherland’ / (I, III) ‘Twas midnight – all was slumber; / A sound-a voice-a shriek- a fearful call! / A long loud Shriek-and silence-did they hear / They heard and rose’ (I, XII), ‘Cold as the marble where his length was laid, / Pale as the beam that o’er his features play’d /, Was Lara stretched: / Yet he was firm, or had been firm till now, / And still defiance knit his gather’d brow; / Though mix’d with terror, senseless as he lay, / There lived upon his lip the wish to slay; / And now was fix’d in horrible repose’ (I, XIII). Again one finds words like ‘firm’, ‘defiance’, ‘terror’,
and ‘wish’ which serve to describe Lara’s emotions, wishes and dispositions. The phrases are further indicators that the agent who describes Lara’s state of mind is the authorial narrator who has the privilege of insight into Lara’s state of mind. By means of the same strategies the authorial narrator characterizes Lara as a gloomy ‘terror’ and yet dangerous person since Lara appears to contemplate or wish to ‘slay’ someone.

Psychonarration occurs again in the further cantos of “Don Juan” and constitute a form by which the authorial narrator attempts to reveal his identity as narrator. Clues that suggest the narrator’s ability to understand a character’s state of mind may be important for our interpretation of the functions he/she performs as narrator. In the manner of one who is well-versed in the techniques of love making, the authorial narrator meticulously conveys the way passion flows from Julia to Don Juan:

Then there were sighs, the deeper for suppression,  
And stolen glances, sweeter for the theft,  
And burning blushes, though for no transgression,  
Tremblings when met, and restlessness when left;  
And these are little preludes to possession,  
Of which young passion cannot be bereft,  
And merely tend to show how greatly love is.  
Embarrass’d at first starting with a novice.

(Byron, “Don Juan” I; LXXIV)

The prelude or pre-love atmosphere characterized by ‘sighs’, ‘burning blushes’, ‘stolen glances’ and ‘tremblings’ are generalizations and are further indicators of the authorial narrator’s presence in the poem. This section and subsequent verses are rendered in a typical heterodiegetic style by means of phrases that suggest the narrator’s knowledge of Julia’s feelings, passions, actions, and motives for decisions she makes. If the reader were presented with the question “who makes the minds, consciousness or emotions of Juan and Julia visible in the text?”, the reader is likely to find answer in the identity of the agent who possesses cognitive privilege and knows what Julia knows, contemplates, and feels including her sentiments. In the love scene passage, it is Juan and Julia whom one finds sighing and looking at each other. Julia’s actions, motives for actions, feelings and dispositions are conveyed in such phrases as ‘Julia’s heart was in an awkward state; / She felt it going and resolved to make / The noblest efforts for herself and mate, / For honour’s, pride’s, religion’s, virtues’s sake / Her resolutions were most truly great / (“Don Juan” I: LXXV); ‘She vow’d she would never see Juan more’ / ‘Grateful she was’ (“Don Juan” I: LXXVI); and ‘she now determined that a virtuous woman / should rather face and overcome temptation’ (“Don Juan” I: LXXVII). A verb of feeling such as ‘felt’, a phrase denoting intention such as ‘she now determined’,
‘she vow’d’, and an adjective indicating a state of mind or mode such as ‘Grateful’ in ‘grateful she was’ could be interpreted to mean that although the agent one finds in action is Julia, it is the authorial narrator who has an insight into psychic processes and reports from a position outside the story. In the examples about Juan’s feelings, disposition and determination as elsewhere, the question of whether absolute authority and textual clues suggesting knowledge of other minds can signal the presence of an authorial narrator can be answered by identifying plot oriented phrases that suggest how the characters feel, think, react or express their emotions. Expressions such as ‘Silent and pensive, idle, restless, slow / Tormented with a wound he could not know,’ (“Don Juan” I: LXXXVII); ‘Young Juan wander’d by the glassy brooks / Thinking unutterable things’ (“Don Juan” I: XC); ‘Julia’s heart was in an awkward state’, ‘she vow’d’, ‘grateful she was’, ‘sore’ (“Don Juan” I: LXXV); and earlier descriptions of Julia in canto I of “Don Juan” in adjectives like ‘cold’, ‘kind’, ‘gentle’ are corroborative examples of states of mind, consciousness and psychic processes relayed by an omniscient narrator in his language. Moreover, the decisions and hesitations about being with Juan, and the tension characterizing this emotional scenario are not expressed verbally by Julia. Rather, the authorial narrator takes the reader directly into Julia’s mind, hence creating the illusion of immediate access into her sensations and thoughts. An example can be seen in the sentence that describes Julia’s state of mind at the time she is sexually motivated and desires to make love with Juan: ‘Grateful she was / Again it opens, it can be no other, / ‘Tis surely Juan now—’ (“Don Juan” I: LXXVI). The technique applied in the above examples is similar to that often described as psychonarration. It is the mind of Julia in action (‘grateful’), but expressed by the narrator in his/her words. It is also the mind of Juan that is emphasized in the verbs ‘thinking’ and ‘thought’ (‘Young Juan wander’d by the glassy brooks / Thinking unutterable things’ (“Don Juan” I: XC); ‘He thought about himself’ (“Don Juan” I: XCII)). By means of such thought verbs and adjectives, the authorial narrator characterises Julia as seductive. The thought techniques also perform other roles denied first-person narrators such as conveying the impression of knowledge of other minds. Of importance is the fact that the all knowing narrator transforms mental states into stories and in so doing appears to construct authorial narration since he/she makes the minds of Julia and Juan accessible to the reader as sources of literary material. Since verbs and adjectives of thoughts and feelings analysed above bring Byron’s narrative style closer to the modern novel with its emphasis on psychologiological characters, they constitute some ways by which psychonarration enters Byron’s poetry and perform the role of characterising narration as authorial. Of importance is the fact that the technique of psychonarration can provide readers
of fiction with one way of writing a novel in the authorial mode. One can rely on such narrative evidence to speak about the development of narrative techniques in poetry.

Further illuminating examples where a poem employs expressions that allow the reader to draw conclusion that narration is authorial occur in a passage focusing on Julia’s thoughts (in a manner of one who is well versed in the techniques of love making) and attempts to ensnare Juan to love her. We will also consider the cognitive verbs as signs of the narrator’s presence in the text. In the passage, a verb of cognition exemplified by ‘thought’ is suggested. Phrases denoting Julia’s contemplations, thoughts and emotional behavior such as ‘she deem’d, / she sigh’d, / suppose, / And if in the meantime her husband died, / But heaven forbid that such a thought should cross / Her brain, though in a dream! / Julia thought / In French’ (“Don Juan” I: LXXXIV) exist and allow room for supposing that there is an external narrator who has an insight into the minds of story characters. In a similar example from the same canto, the authorial narrator takes the reader directly into Juan’s mind when he reports: ‘Young Juan wander’d by the glassy brooks / Thinking unutterable things’ (I; XC). Expressions such as ‘pensive’, ‘tormented’, ‘grief’, and ‘thinking’ are ways of leading a reader directly into a character’s mind, thoughts, and emotions, (it is these mind states that constitute narration) but significantly constitute further clues for narratorial omniscience and voice.

In addition, evidence that narration in “Don Juan” focuses predominantly on the character’s states of mind and thus provides clues for interpreting a text as narrated in the authorial voice is provided by the following stanzas about Lambro’s home coming characterized by verbs of perception and cognition:

He saw his white walls shining in the sun,
His garden trees all shadowy and green;
He heard his rivulet’s light bubbling run
The distant dog-bark; and perceived between
The umbrage of the wood so cool and dun
The moving figures, and the sparkling sheen
Of arms (in the east all arm)-and various dyes
Of colour’d garbs, as bright as butterflies.

(Byron, “Don Juan” III; XXVII)

And as the spot where they appear he nears,
Surprised at these unwonted signs of idling,
He hears- alas! No music of the spheres,
But an unhallow’d, earthly sound of fiddling!
A melody which made him doubt his ears,
The cause being past his guessing or unriddling;
A pipe, too, and a drum, and shortly after,
A most unoriental roar of laughter.
In passages from “Don Juan” (III: XXV; XXVII; XXXVIII; XXVI) describing Lambro’s home coming, the authorial narrator’s presence is made visible by means of psychonarration: A verb like ‘heard’ is one way the authorial narrator leads the reader into Lambro’s mind and is also a sign of the presence of authorial narration. The verb is link to Lambro and suggests that the opinion that the colour of the dress is as bright as a butterfly is that of Lambro although the voice one hears is that of the narrator. In the further example about Lambro’s disgruntleness regarding the way his wealth is lavishly wasted while he is at sea, one reads: ‘But Lambro saw all these things with aversion, / Perceiving in his absence such expenses, / Dreading that climax of all human ills’ (“Don Juan” III: XXXV). The mind and thoughts of Lambro are made accessible in the adjective and the verb ‘aversion’ and ‘dreading’ respectively. In a passage about Lambro’s home coming, his state of mind- probably one of excitement and anxiety is conveyed in the following phrases: ‘On seeing his chimney-smoke, felt glad’; (“Don Juan” III: XXVI)/ ‘He- being a man who seldom used a word / Too much, and wishing gladly to surprise / In fact much more astonish’d than delighted / To find so much good company invited’ (III, XXXVII)/ ‘He did not know’ (“Don Juan” III: XXXVIII). Lambro’s intensions, anxiety and motives are suggested in words that convey his state of mind such as ‘wishing’ ‘gladly’ and ‘astonish’d’. If the reader is confronted with the question of who makes the mind of Lambro visible in the text, and how; the reader is likely to make recourse to plot oriented words like ‘aversion’, ‘dreading’, ‘wishing’, ‘felt glad’, and ‘astonish’d’ since they constitute the means by which the states of mind, emotions and feelings of Lambro are conveyed. ‘Gladly’ and ‘astonished’ are adverb and adjective respectively that describe Lambro’s emotions of joy and embarrassment or surprise. ‘Felt glad’ also conveys Lambro’s emotions of joy as he approaches his home. ‘Aversion’ points towards the attitude of hatred that characterizes Lambro’s mind when he notices the crowd in his compound in a festive mood. Verbs that convey a state of mind not only suggest the authorial narrator’s unrestricted privilege of knowledge and insight into Lambro’s internal processes. They have the additional function of contrasting narration in the third-person from one in the first-person since they lead the reader to see certain privileges denied the homodiegetic narrator. The example of texts which contains verbs of thoughts and perception that are particularly useful for articulating the subjectivities of story internal characters, as well as the external voice that knows and describes these subjectivities function as corroborative evidence of how authorial narration enters the text. Mental verbs in the
examples above give us the sign which narratology recognizes as psychonarration and is suited to construct psychological characters. Such forms of psychonarration call to mind Romantic reliance on subjectivity and more specifically modern prose with its emphasis on mental settings and psychological characters, and suggest one way Byron could have contributed to reproducing these literary periods in narrative structures. By means of such evidence, one may also say that Byron’s poetry provides strategies for the writing of a novel. The same strategies may also trigger a reading of a text as authorial narration.

In a passage from “Lara” (I; XX, XXI) about Lara’s psychic responses to events at a festival, the device of psychonnaration can allow for a construction of authorial narration. In a sentence like ‘And Lara gazed on these sedately glad’, Lara’s emotions of joy are conveyed in the verb ‘glad’. The verb ‘glad’ which conveys the state of mind of Lara suggests that the narrator has unrestricted privilege of insight into Lara’s mental life, a privilege that marks authorial narrator as distinct from first-person homodiegetic and figural narration. This is one way an authorial narrator can make himself/herself known in a poem. Similarly, in a passage from “Don Juan” (V, CXVIII) about Gulbayez’s attempted seduction of Juan, psychonarration again allows for an interpretation of the text as authorial. Gulbayez’s apparent embarrassment at Juan’s emotional behavior is conveyed in the phrase: ‘She [Gulbayez] was a good deal shock’d at tears’. In the further lines the narrator describes Gulbayez’s thoughts, intensions and dispositions when her seductive advances are turned down by Juan: ‘Her first thought was to cut off Juan’s head’ / (“Don Juan” V: CXXXIX), ‘She thought to stab herself’, / ‘She thought of killing Juan’, (“Don Juan” V: CXL). The mind of Gulbayez is conveyed by means of mental verbs such as shock and thought. Juan’s intensions and emotional reactions are conveyed in the following phrases: ‘Juan was moved: he had made up his mind / To be impaled, / Rather than sin’ (“Don Juan” V: CXL). The strategies analyzed above may also trigger suppositions that the authorial narrator not only explores consciousness, but also tend to locate action in the mind of characters.

A similar and conspicuous signal by which poetry can be analyzed to reveal the identity of an authorial heterodiegetic narrator and his/her functions is the technique of dream in “Don Juan” IV:

She dream’d of being alone on the sea shore,
Chain’d to a rock; she knew not how, but stir
She could not from the spot, and the loud roar
Grew, and each wave rose roughly, threatening her;
And o’er her upper lip they seem’d to pour
Until she sobb’d for breath, and soon they were
Foaming o’er her lone head, so fierce and high-
Each broke to drown her, yet she could not die.

(Byron, “Don Juan” IV: XXXI)

That a dream can provide corroborative clues for the interpretation of narration as grounded on complete and unrestricted knowledge and enable an understanding of textual manifestations of authorial narrator is nowhere more evident than in “Don Juan” IV. The event that constitutes narration in the passage above is Haide’s terrific dream which is recounted by means of verbs expressing psychic action. The indications that narration in the passage evolves around a psychic event are cognitive verbs like ‘dreams’ and ‘knew’ in ‘she dreams’ and ‘she knew not how’. In such mental phrases, what are emphasized are not a physical experience, but the feelings and impressions of someone dreaming. In addition, verbs and phrases that express cognition like ‘dream’d, ’(‘She dream’d of being alone on the sea shore,) ‘she knew not how’, and ‘seem’d’ (the loud roar / o’er her upper lip seem’d to pour’) could be interpreted to mean that the authorial narrator is aware of what the character-Haidee thought, knew and what she did not know. Such cognitive verbs that direct attention to mental states of Haidee are proof of the presence of omniscient narrator in all places where there is action-mental or physical including the mind, and are also evidence that he/she can make the mind a setting for events that constitutes the story. The mind thus becomes a source of literary material. Again such mental verbs are methodological tools available for constructing authorial narration in poetry.

An analysis of the following passage from “Don Juan” which again shifts the setting or story to Juan’s mind through indirect discourse is suited to reveal not only the identity of the teller as an authorial narrator, but also his/her functions:

He thought about himself, and the whole earth,  
Of man the wonderful, and of the stars,  
And how the deuce they ever could have birth;  
And then he thought of earthquakes, and of wars,  
How many miles the moon might have in girth,  
Of air- balloons, and of the many bars  
To perfect knowledge of the boundless skies;-
And the he thought of Donna Julia’s eyes.

(Byron, “Don Juan” I; XCII)

The third-person sentences contain a verb of cognition ‘thought’ and constitutes another illustrative example of how the authorial narrator builds his story on the thoughts and reflections of a character. The mental verb ‘thought’ occurs three times in the above passage and I rely on it as textual evidence to suggest that the narrator has an insight into the mind of Juan-the thinker of thoughts. Such a manner of narration that emphasizes on the thoughts
going on in the character’s mind and not action per se can be interpreted as a way the authorial narrator transforms mental events into stories and is suited to provide information about omniscient narration or better still authorial narrative situation.

More corroborative instances where stories are constructed on verbs that express cognition and thus suited to construct authorial narration are scattered in the narrating Cantos of “Don Juan”, and play quite different functions. The scene in which Julia seduces Don Juan, and is caught in the love act with Juan provides an illustrative example of omniscient third-person (authorial) narration. The story of Juan’s seduction by Julia, and the subsequent embarrassment of Don Alphonso (Julia’s jealous husband) are told in the past tense by the heterodiegetic narrator, using verbs of cognition. The story of seduction is presented in ways that frames of thought, feelings and emotions not only serve as cognitive indicators of inner life, but also as means by which the narrator’s knowledge of the emotions, fears, and feelings of the story-internal characters are constructed in poetry. Let us consider the verbs of cognition ‘heard’, ‘thought’ and ‘forgot’ in the following passage as corroborative reinforcements of my claim: ‘He […] heard a voice in all the winds; and then / he thought / Of wood-nymphs and immortal bowers, / he forgot the hours’ (“Don Juan” I: XCIV). Notice also that the narrator knows about Juan’s memories as well as events that Juan could not remember as in ‘he forgot the hours’. While emotions, verbs that express cognition, knowledge, motives for action mind dreaming, thoughts, knowledge, feelings, level of awareness and dispositions can be interpreted to mean narration is focused partly on psychological characters, I would again argue that signs of the mind in action are signs of the presence of the omniscient narrator, the only textual agent with the cognitive ability to read other’s minds and thoughts. A homodiegetic narrator, the narrating ‘I’ in particular, and/or the autodiegetic first-person narrating character has restricted omniscience and cannot have access into such hidden areas of the mind, nor can pass moral judgements on characters in action. The above clues are therefore sufficient to create an impression that the narrative situation in the texts analyzed is authorial heterodiegetic.

The potential of metaphors to construct an authorial narrative situation and by extension the functions of such a device can also be demonstrated in Byron’s poetry. Early examples occur in “Don Juan” IV when the narrator attempts to describe, by means of images Juan’s state of mind at the time he is caught with Haidee. The pains associated with feelings of separation especially when Juan and his lover, Haidee, are forced by Lambro to separate is conveyed in the image of a bee that stings: ‘Twelve days and nights she wither’d thus; at last /
Without a groan, or sigh, or glance, to show / A parting pang’ (“Don Juan” IV: LXIX). The metaphoric association of emotions with pains from a sting suggests the kind of painful experience which characterizes unfulfilled love, but can also serve as a consequence of imagination and of the narrator’s ability to enter another’s mind and describe their painful feelings in images. Not only does metaphoric language especially psychoanaloggies direct attention to the mind and to the position of the speaker as external; of importance is the fact that narrative is temporarily poeticized. The use of suggestive metaphors may draw attention to the extent to which a poem can construct its stories on techniques of representing thoughts which is more emphasized in narrative fiction. What is also productive in this mode of narrative is the use of cognitive devices of metaphors to construct authorial omniscient narration.

In addition to the function of granting the heterodiegetic narrator the privilege of reading other characters’ minds, metaphors or psychoanaloggies have the additional significance of foregrounding the plot, and thematizing narration. A typical example is the night scene in “Don Juan” IV, where Haidee and Juan are psychologically tormented by fear of an impending doom, a psychic event that the narrator conveys in both the images of the ‘wind’ and ‘flame’ to create the impression of one affected by electrical current:

I know not why, but in that hour to-night,  
Even as they gazed, a sudden tremor came,  
And swept, as ‘twere, across their heart’s delight,  
Like the wind o’er a harp-string, or a flame,  
When one is shook in sound, and one in sight:  
And thus some boding flash’d through either frame,  
And call’d from Juan’s breast a faint low sigh,  
While one new tear arose in Haidée’s eye.

(Byron, “Don Juan” IV: XXI)

The above passage focuses on fear and presentiments of an impending tragedy going on in the minds of Juan and Haidee as conveyed in the phrases ‘a sudden tremor came, / And swept, as ‘twere, across their heart’s delight, / And thus some boding flash’d through either frame’. The presentiment of doom in the minds of Juan and Haidee is compared to first, heat, suggested by the image of a burning ‘flame’, and then to an earthquake or ‘tremor’ that ravages everything on its passage. This comparison is the work of imagination because it takes place in the mind. This is what signals the psychoanalogy in the passage. The prophetic fear or illusion of ill feelings has the magnitude of burning heat or electrical current and is conveyed in metaphoric language. This has an effect on plot as the inward fear prepares Juan and Haidee for the eventual disruption of their love. The phrases ‘a sudden tremor came, / And swept, as ‘twere,
across their heart’s delight, / And thus some boding flash’d through either frame’ suggest
danger associated with ‘tremor’ or earthquake. This has a link to the ill feelings tormenting
the two lovers especially when their minds are compared to (‘flame’). This event is psychic
since it is the imagination in the minds of the two lovers that constitute the story. It is
important to note that the authorial narrator takes the reader to the minds of the lovers
simultaneously by means of images that suggest danger as analysed above. The ability to see
and interpret other minds by means of images is the exclusive prerogative of the authorial
narrator. Again, the fear of an impending doom (which foregrounds the eventual disruption of
the love relationship of Juan and Haidee by Lambro) and the main activity of imagination that
Juan has resulted to is suggested in the phrase ‘That large black prophet eye seem’d to dilate /
As if their last day of a happy date / were gone’ (“Don Juan” IV: XXII). The expression ‘The
large black prophet eye’ is used in relation to Juan and may suggest that Juan possesses some
spiritual or supernatural potential or what is called second sight. In addition to the
psychoanalogies, the expression ‘the large black prophet eye seem’d to dilate / And follow far
the disappearing sun,’ suggests some spiritual powers possess by Juan and calls to mind the
notion of medieval mysticism often linked to Romantic imagination. The ability to know and
interpret the feelings, dreams, anxieties and emotions going on in other minds has a crucial
link with the authorial narrative situation constructed in the above passages. Since it is the
authorial narrator that has an insight into this hidden area of the story character’s mind and
makes it available to the reader, one may suggest that the presence of psychoanalogies is
already an indication of the presence of the agent who sees into mental states of characters.
Knowledge of the character’s imagination again links the above passages to omniscience
authorial narration.

Further examples that suggest the importance of psychoanalogies for constructing
authorial narration occurs when the narrator compares Lady Adeline’s unbridled love passions
(or desire for a sexual relationship with Juan whom she admires) to a volcanic eruption or
‘frozen’ champagne’ (“Don Juan” VIII: XXXVI, XXXVII). Reaction to this passage, M. K.
Joseph (1966: 216) remarks that ‘[i]n such a construction, we seem to see the narrator at
work, selecting his images, working them from one level to another, or drawing more closely
towards the object’. Notice that M.K Joseph attributes metaphoric descriptions in the passage
to the ‘narrator’ as the agent who who picks and chooses (216). Joseph not only fails to
conceptualize the voice and agent constructing these images. Much is left unsaid regarding
the real identity and quality of the narrative voice. In passages like the ones above, any
analysis focussing on narration may start by asking the question of what narrative voice the
psychoanalogies can construct. The question can be answered by taking into consideration the manner in which the narrator tells his/her story. The images one finds in the passage above have further functions that are relevant for the analysis of the passages as heterodiegetic (omniscient) narration.

Adeline’s love passions for Juan mentioned in passing above are conveyed in the image of boiling Lava or a volcanic eruption. When there is a volcanic eruption, lava flow is uncontrollable. The association of a volcanic eruption with love passions only serves to convey the impression of unbridled sexual passion and also suggests the danger that may be associated with love passions. The ability to convey another character’s emotions or hidden sexual passions in imagistic structures raises the question of the agent that can see and describe desires like love instincts or its manifestations. The mental device involved in determining the narrator’s omniscience is use of imagination evident in the metaphor of the volcanic eruption which is linked to Adeline’s desires, passions and emotions of the sexual kind. It is crucial to point out that such metaphoric associations reveal the authorial narrator’s exclusive prerogative of insight into the extramental areas of the mind like passion. The images themselves are necessary for the inclusion of psychoanalogies in the construction of authorial narrative situation in Byron’s poetry. One may, on the basis of the imaginative aspects of metaphors say that psychoanalogies can make the mind a setting for stories, and by extension allow for conclusive statements about how the fictional world is constructed in poetry by means of images. The characterization of the narrator as omniscience and authorial necessarily takes into consideration the use of psychoanalogies.

In the context of Byron’s poetry, unreliability may be a signal for analyzing authorial (heterodiegetic) narration in a bid to speak about his/her functions although the concept of unreliability is often associated with first-person homodiegetic narration. Unreliability is signaled by many clues but the most prominent one that features in “Don Juan” is called paralepsis (Genette’s terminology (1980)).

I know not why, but in that hour to-night,  
Even as they gazed, a sudden tremor came,  
And swept, as ’twere, across their heart’s delight,  
Like the wind o’er a harp-string, or a flame,  
When one is shook in sound, and one in sight:  
And thus some boding flash’d through either frame,  
And call’d from Juan’s breast a faint low sigh,  
While one new tear arose in Haidée’s eye.

(Byron, “Don Juan” IV; XXI)
Unreliability is signaled in the first line of the above stanza by the authorial narrator’s pretence to lack of knowledge ‘I know not why’. The authorial narrator’s ignorance about what happened in Juan’s mind, and his apparent pretence to lack knowledge of what took place or motivated the meeting between Juan and Julia in the earlier canto makes his narration appear unreliable considering that narratology accords unrestricted cognition and knowledge privilege to this narrating agent. Another example occurs in the passage where the authorial narrator, who is conventionally endowed with unrestricted authority of cognition and space contradictorily claims not to know how Juan thought and felt when seduced by Julia: ‘And while she ponder’d this, / one hand on Juan’s carelessly was thrown, / I cannot know what Juan thought of this’ (“Don Juan” I: CIX; CXII). In an earlier example, the authorial (heterodiegetic) narrator gives the impression of following Juan and Julia to a love setting, but again withholds information regarding their meeting: ‘she sate, but not alone; I know not well / how this same interview had taken place, / But there she and Juan, face to face’- (“Don Juan” I: CV). The narrator had earlier informed us that Julia has fallen in love with Juan and has provided evidence triggering construal that Julia is well versed in the techniques of seduction and is determined to seduce Juan. In the subsequent part of the same story, the narrator’s claims to lack of knowledge about Juan’s feelings, and of their engagement is ironical and becomes difficult to reconcile with his external position in the story which, by definition is uncircumscribed by cognitive and partial limits. If one goes by narratological definitions that attribute unrestricted cognition or omniscience of knowledge and authority to authorial (heterodiegetic) narration, one may be tempted to find in the above examples of authorial discourse what Jahn (2005: N3.15), echoing Genette, calls ‘transgression’, or ‘infraction’ (or even parallipsis).

Evaluations and generalizing abstractions (which enable an understanding that authorial narrators give information beyond what relates to the internal processes of the characters - including the ability to ‘establish links between the perspectives and actions of the character’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 120) - is another significant element in the interpretation of Byron’s narrative poems as authorial. In the manner of heterodiegetic narration, the narrator of “Don Juan” (I; VII) begins his narrative by giving expository information to a supposedly textual addressee about Juan’s ancestry: ‘My way is to begin with the beginning / Narrating somewhat of Don Juan’s father, / And also of his mother, if you’d rather.’ The expression ‘you’ positions the narrator in close proximity to someone to whom he/she is telling the story, a privilege denied first-person narrators for the simple reason that they are in the fictional world. Apparently assuming that there is someone listening to his/her
story, the narrator shows detailed knowledge about events that happened before the story including Juan’s birth and upbringing: ‘In Sevile was he born, a pleasant city / Famous for oranges and women-he / Don Juan’s parents lived beside the river, / His father’s name was Jose-Don, / His mother was a learned lady, famed’ (“Don Juan” I; VIII, IX, X). In addition, the moralising aspect is one of the extra representational features of certain poems, and constitutes one factor readers can resort to in the process of interpreting a narrative poem as authorial heterodiegetic. This is noticeable when the narrator creates a Christian upbringing for Don Juan as grounds to condemn early sex (Juan falls in love with Julia at the age of thirteen): ‘When she had twenty years, and thirteen he; / But I am not sure I should have smiled / When he was sixteen, Julia twenty-three’ (“Don Juan” I; LXIX). In another example from “Don Juan”, (I; LXVII), the narrator describes Inez’s acquaintance with her friend’s (Julia) husband as ‘silence scandal’ perhaps to show his attitude of scorn towards adultery. The element of moralizing which is another textual manifestation of the authorial narrator enters the above text when he/she condemns adultery and early sex. The narrator’s negative judgement and attitude towards these love affairs may be an attempt to signal a violation of Puritan conventional morality into which Byron was born. It is also important to note that generalizing signals point towards the narrator’s knowledge about religion, his insights into personality, moral values, and ‘factors that may constitute the dominant system of norms and values within a society’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 121) particularly the Puritan society. What is clear in the above analysis is the fact that the heterodiegetic narrator of “Don Juan” carries out further functions (see Nünning/Nünning 2004: 120) including making commentary, moralizing and value judgements on the actions of the characters.

In the context of Byron’s narrative poetry, one may not talk about evidence that guide an understanding of a text as authorial heterodiegetic narration without mentioning the narrator-perspective. The fundamental question to answer here about narrative poems that construct the narrator-perspective is that of the way in which perspectives can be gauged and accounted for as an authorial heterodiegetic device. The strategy is necessary here because it permits the reader to see two different narrating agents, accorded two different perspectives-the character that is discerned only in mental devices but whose perspective is embedded in that of the superior narrator by means of the same devices. The strategy is necessary here because it permits the authorial narrator to move into the character’s past and back to present for interpretation of events. An illustrative example is the stanza in which the narrator recounts the story of Harold’s psychological stress and resolve to go for adventures:

And now Childe Harold was sore sick at heart,
And from his fellow bacchanals would flee;
’Tis said, at times the sullen tear would start
But Pride congeal’d the drop within his ee:
Apart he stalk’d in joyless reverie,
And from his native land resolved to go,
And visit scorching climes beyond the sea;
With pleasure drugg’d, he almost long’d for woe,
And e’en for change of scene would seek the shades below.

(Byron, “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” I; VI)

That narration in the above lines contains two perspectives- that of the character embedded in the narrator’s cannot be disputed. The deictic ‘now’ functions to mark the gap between the time of utterance and the past of narration, or of Harold’s emotional state at the time of his departure from his native land. The narrator discloses that Harold was disturbed or depressed ‘sore’ and ‘sick’ at heart, proud and harassed by ‘joyless reverie’ at times. The ‘now’ of the narration is the past now. It represents Harold as a self in the past, a self whose perspective is conveyed in phrases that suggest intensions, dispositions and motives for action such as ‘Joyless reverie’ and ‘resolved’ as they convey the sad state of feelings of Child Harold. The deictic ‘now’ may refer to the time of telling and not the time Harold experienced the events. It is also appropriate to explain how omniscience is made textually manifest. The narrator knows about Harold’s unspoken intensions and hence discloses that at the moment of experience, Harold ‘was’ ‘sore sick at heart’ and ‘resolved to go’ on self exile. The distance between the time of utterance and the past of narration is also psychological. Consequently, one may argue that when the authorial narrator reveals the thoughts and feelings of Harold in the phrases ‘sore sick at heart’, and ‘joyless reverie’, he is expressing not only his present view point, (the present of narration), but also Harold’s perspective on events. Since the events have been experienced sometimes in the past by Harold; and the narrator who knows about it now reports by projecting his present perspective, the perspective of Harold- the character can be said to be embedded in that of the heterodiegetic narrator. By means of mental verbs that convey the emotional experience of solitude, joyless dreams, both the role of deictics and narrator-perspective become so important in tracking the heterodiegetic narrator of the text, and in speaking about his/her narrating functions of converting the mind of Harold into a setting for events.

The role of tense as a factor in the interpretation of a text as an authorial heterodiegetic narrative (considering that tense can be accorded narrative authority) can be justified by analysing passages of poems that construct retrospective narration. The Battle of Waterloo in “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” (III: XXI) is narrated retrospectively by an external voice; that of someone who is capable of shuffling between the past and present to bring events to life.
Fleischman’s (1990) statement that tense bears the marks of its origin is nowhere more evident than in the poem. In the lines which focus on the historical Waterloo event (‘There was a sound of revelry at night, / And Belgium’s capital had gather’d then / A thousand hearts beat happily; / But hush! hark! a deep sound strikes like a rising knell’), retrospective narration is marked by past tense signals such as ‘was’, ‘gather’d’, ‘shone’, ‘arose’, ‘look’d’, and ‘went’. The authorial narrator enjoys one prerogative associated with retrospective narration. This narrator travels freely in space and time, and narrates to the reader events that take place in two or more different places simultaneously. The narrator’s description of the ball dance, which is interrupted by war signal, gives the impression of someone who is present on the physical scene of action. The narrator does not only follow the characters to a ball room dance in Belgium; he is also present in the minds of the characters interpreting their emotions at the same time as suggested in the phrase ‘A thousand hearts beat happily’. The narrator reveals that the party is attended by many people, including ‘fair women and brave men’ whose ‘hearts beat happily’. He goes further to describe those with passion for seduction in the phrase ‘soft eyes look’d love to eyes which spake again’. What the reader discerns from this kind of narration is the fact that the narrator is concurrently in discourse in the past, in the present moment of narration (‘But hush! Hark! A deep sound strikes a rising knell’), and in the consciousness of his characters (‘A thousand hearts beat happily’) as he appears to know what is taking place in the minds of several actors of the fictional world including their emotions. The use of present tense signals (‘strikes’ and ‘beat’) and past tense forms simultaneously also bring out one manifestation of authorial narration—the ability to be in many places and many settings at the same time. Such a narrative style has a function for my interpretation of a text as authorial because it provides linguistic evidence for marking off authorial narrators as distinct from first-person narrators. That is not to say that a first-person narrator cannot shuffle between past and present. Nor do I mean to create the impression that narrators in the first-person cannot narrate the consciousness of others. A homodiegetic narrating ‘I’ also enjoys the power of depicting the perceptions of its former self, the ‘experiencing I’, the only difference being that he/she is in the world of characters and cannot enter the minds of other characters or describe how they feel or think. Consequently, tense create an understanding of an authorial narrator who travels freely in space and time: one that can perceive the minds of several characters at once, and may recount also psychic events concurrently with external ones. Tense in Byron’s poetry can thus account for a text as authorial heterodiegetic.
Indications that there is a combination of retrospective and simultaneous narrations in the same passage or poem may constitute another way of illustrating the uses of tense to locate utterance or voice to an authorial narrator. As one of the many examples, the authorial narrator of “Lara” (“Lara” I XX, XXIX, XV; “Lara” II, III, XVII, XVIII) uses two different tense forms in many passages simultaneously. The inconsistency in the use of tenses which is also a significant factor in determining authorial narration can be illustrated using the examples below:

There is a festival, where knights and dames,
And aught that wealth or lofty lineage claims,
Appear a high-born and a welcome guest
To Otto’s hall came Lara with the rest.
The long carousal shakes the illumined hall,
Well speeds alike the banquet and the ball;
And the gay dance of bounding Beauty’s train
Links grace and harmony in happiest chain: 
[…].
(Byron, “Lara” I; XX)

The narrator starts his/her narration in the above lines in the present tense (for instance, ‘there is’) and the impression created is that the ongoing feast or event is simultaneous with narration. The use of present tense signal in words like ‘is’, ‘appear’, ‘shakes’, and ‘links’ convey the impression that an ongoing action is simultaneous with telling. This impression that action and telling are concurrent is however contrasted in the further lines when the narrator interpolates his narration with past tense signals discernible in ‘To Otto’s hall came Lara’. Another example where one finds a mixture of tenses is the authorial narrator’s report of the fierce battle that Lara leads against his people in which the former is mortally wounded (“Lara” I; XV). Here, the narrator repeatedly mixes tenses, shuffling between the past and present tenses. The present tense signals in the following examples: ‘Commanding’, ‘aiding’, ‘animating all / , Cheers Lara’s voice, and waves or strikes his steel, / ’, Inspiring hope’ (“Lara” I; XV) would again create an impression of a narrative that is not distanced from the time of war, a situation similar to simultaneous narration in first-person texts. In the same passage however, the narrator returns instantly to the past tense when he speaks of the determination of the opponents to go on fighting in the war front and of their motive for such an adamant and daring attitude: ‘None fled, for well they knew that flight were vain’ (“Lara” I; XV). The use of ‘now’ in the expression directing attention to Lara as he gives instructions in the battle ground: ‘Now was the time, he waved his hand on high’, also has significance in aiding one to determine the kind of narratorial voice the passage constructs. The ‘now’ of the passage may suggest the past ‘now’ when events actually took place. The use of two disparate
tense forms in the same narrative may create confusion for the reader and may suggest inconsistency in the use of tense on the part of the narrator. Such a mode of narration can fulfill functions as well. That the narrator can shuffle between the past and present simultaneously only creates the impression that narratorial voice is authorial since it is only this agent that narrative theory endows with unrestricted authority, uncircumscribed spatial privilege and knowledge potential.

Forms of metanarrative commentaries occur in many of Byron’s narrative poems and are relevant factors in the interpretation of passages as authorial. Metanarration exists on various levels in narrative poems - the extradiegetic and diegetic forms, metatexts (texts on texts), and at hypodiegetic levels (texts in texts). In the poems I propose to analyse to enable me speak about the role of metannative commentaries in fulfilling narrative functions including that of constructing authorial narration, I will consider clues such as self reflexive references, commentary, narratee signals or forms of reader addresses, metaphoric metanarration, flash-forwards and flashbacks. My argument that Byron’s poetry can contribute to the creation of authorial narration and cultures and most importantly literary culture by means of metanarrative devices remain a question to be answered. One form of metanarrative device is the narratee strategy. Throughout “Don Juan”, the narrator consistently addresses a narratee with whom he appears to have intimate communication. The digressive stanzas that follows the narrator’s description of Lambro’s feelings, emotions, attitudes or opinions about the feast he witnessed (in his compound on his return from a sea journey) may help clarify the point that the authorial narrator makes himself known by means of the device called narratee:

> Perhaps you think in stumbling on this feast  
> He flew into a passion, and in fact  
> There was no mighty reason to be pleased;  
> Perhaps you prophesy some sudden act,  
> The whip, the rack, or dungeon at the least,  
> To teach his people to be more exact,

>(Byron, “Don Juan” III; XL)

206 For more on hypodiegetic, see Rimmon–Kenan (1983) and Matei Calinescu and Douwe Fokkema, (1990: 225); See also Rimmon Kenan (1983: 92) for more explanation on intradiegetic and hypodiegetic narrative. For an elaborate discussion on metanarration, their forms and functions see Ansgar Nünning (2004a: 11-15).
You're wrong.-He was the mildest manner’d man
Tha ever scuttled a ship or cut a throat;
With such true breeding of a gentleman,
You never could divine his real thought;

(Byron, “Don Juan” III; XLI)

The apparent narrator-narratee communication in the above passages is signaled by ‘you’ and creates the impression of the narrator’s direct address to his listener. At times the narrator presumes to know what the narratee is thinking about Lambro and disagrees with the narratee’s judgement: ‘You’re wrong. - He was the mildest manner’d man / You never could devine his real thought’ (“Don Juan” III; XLI). By condemning the reader’s judgement, the narrator appears to be aware that not all readers may share his opinion about Lambro. By addressing the reader and disclosing the latter’s thoughts and impressions about Lambro, the narrator appears to be addressing a silent listener. The intimacy with which the narrator addresses his narratee (‘you’ is used four times) may encourage a suggestion that this narrator is placed on the same external level of discourse with the narratee whom he addresses, and can talk directly to him, a fact that is rare in first-person narrative. The metanarrative element of the addressee is thus manifestly an additional manifestation of authorial narration.

In my reading of “Don Juan” as an authorial narrated poem, I will make recourse to passages that contain metanarrative comments207 in the form of digressions and metanarrative interventions of the self-reflexive narrative208. A typical example of metanarrative expression which has consequences for my analysis of a passage as authorial occurs in “Don Juan” (III; I): “Hail, muse! Et caetera – we left Juan sleeping, pillowed upon a fair and happy breast”. This line metaphorically captures the lovers’ state of mind, but also functions to locate omniscience since the narrator who has knowledge previlegde that allows him to know how other characters in the story feel. In the passages cited above, the extradiegetic level is signaled by the appearance of the extradiegetic narrator resulting in introduction of authorial third person voice that Genette would call the extradiegetic narrator (Calinescu and Fokkema 1990: 211). The presence of digressions and direct address to the narratee highlights the nature and manifestation of authorial narration. The reader would recognize that the narrative of the hierarchical diegesis refers to him/herself as ‘I’ and ‘We’ even though he relays his

207 Although comments are detached from the narrated world, they still do not possess a high degree of generality since they refer to one specific object, i.e. the act of narrating. (cf Ansgar Nünning 2004a: 18).

208 Not all self-reflexive narrations are a technique, for example ‘mise en abyme’ is self-reflexive, but not a metanarrative (cf. Ansgar Nünning 2004a: 19).
story in the third-person using Don Juan as the hero, and other characters like Julia, Lambro, Haidee, and Adeline etc.

In another metanarrative commentary, the narrator not only foresees, but focalizes Lambro’s thoughts, his predictable malignity of spirit and deceitful temperament: ‘With a peculiar smile, which, by the way boded no good, whatever it expressed’ (“Don Juan” III: XLII); ‘Lambro’s reception at his people’s banquet / Was such as fire accords to a wet blanket’ (“Don Juan” III: XXVI); ‘He lay coil’d like the boa in the wood; / But in his silence there was much to rue,’ (III: XLVIII); ‘The cubless tigress in her jungle raging / Is dreadful to the shepherd and his flock; / The ocean when its yeasty war is waging / Is awful to the vessel near the rock’ (III: LVIII). Notice that metanarrative comments come into the poem in the form psychoanalogies. When the narrator foregrounds the eventual disruption of the love between Juan and Haidee by Lambro, he uses violent and destructive images. The comparison of Lambro to a wild snake in the wood; to the tigress raging and to the ocean currents could suggest Lambro’s destructiveness of passion. By means of metanarrative devices, the narrator characterizes Lambro in violent and destructive animal and nature images. The metaphors could be seen as a deliberate attempt by the narrator to reveal the temperament of Lambro as well as foreground the tragedy that will befall the lovers- Juan and Haidee. The narrator attempts to convey Lambro’s temperament or character in images of violence that are able to convey his feelings and nature. In my analysis, the metanarrative psychoanalogies are considered to be a manifestation of authorial narration. Since psychoanalogies in the above passages provide some hints that may foreground the disruption of the love affair between Juan and Haidee, the device has the potential of fostering the plot of the love affair between Juan and Haidee. Such metanarrative comments and metaphors are likely to foreground continuity of the narrative or foreshadow what future events will look like. The psychological event - fear, love and its disruption - are foregrounded in such violent but beautiful and suggestive metaphors of the ‘cubless tigress’, ‘raging’ in her jungle and the ocean associated with war and awe. Juan and Haidee are in Lambro’s ‘jungle’ or estate, and he is perhaps the ‘cubless tigress raging’. Lambro’s threats and temperament have simply been thematized in metaphors of violence, destruction and awe.

When the narrator describes Haidee’s new patron, Juan, as a ‘Foe’ who, ‘Had soiled the current of her sinless years, / And turned her pure heart’s purest blood to tears!’ (“Don Juan” III, I), he is hinting at the issue of tragedy and sin. Based on the suggestive potential of metaphoric images, the reader may consider Juan’s love for Haidee as a misstep that will end
in tragedy and punishment from a loving father who is not happy with the intruder’s influence on his daughter: ‘But Lambro saw all these things with aversion’ (III; XXXV). The metannarative devices discussed above are capable of foregrounding the act of narrating, and are important for marking narration as authorial.

If the reader accepts that metanarrative digression is vital for interpreting a text as authorial, attention needs to be paid to “Don Juan” for evidence of the device and for functions it may trigger in analysis:

But let me to my story: I must own,  
If I have any fault, it is digression-  
Leaving my people to proceed alone,  
While I soliloquize beyond expression;  
But these are my addresses from the throne,  
Which put off business to the ensuing session:  
Forgetting each omission is a loss to  
The world, not quite so great as Ariosto.

(Byron, “Don Juan” III; XCVI)

The strategy is that of meta narrative digressions. The digressing comments about Ariosto do not appear to disorientate the reader from the extradiegetic level of the story since the voice is still that of the external agent. The extradiegetic narrative voice is the author of the commentaries. Reporting from an external position, the narrator comments on his narration and also digresses to other issues in the manner of an epic narrative. Structurally and content wise, the metanarrative digression brings into the passage of the poem certain forms of expression often associated with epic narratives and thus have a relevance for my discussion of narration considering the fact that digressive metannarative commentaries are often associated with authorial narration.

Structurally, metadigressions also enter the poem in form of genre markers and may encourage a reading of “Don Juan” as authorial. The narrator’s comment about the nature of his narrative is relevant here:

My poem’s epic, and is meant to be  
Divided in twelve books; each book containing,  
With love, and war, a heavy gale at sea,  
A list of ships, and captains, and kings reigning,  
New characters; the episodes are three:  
A panoramic view of hell’s in training,  
After the style of Virgil and of Homer,  
So that my name of Epic’s no misnomer.

(Byron, “Don Juan” I; CC)

The metanarrative commentary in the above passage is digression. The disgression about the nature and scope of epic may permit the reader to notice a complex interplay of genres
The example where Juan and Haidee’s love are compared to a barren island using saddest sea images probably to emphasize its disruption or unfulfilled nature is another metannarrative digressive instance that may project narratorial voice and is thus worthy of note: ‘That isle is now all desolate and bare, / No stone is there to show, no tongue to say / What was; no dirge, except the hollow sea’s / Mourns o’er the beauty of the Cyclades’ (“Don Juan” IV; LXXII). Metannarrative digressions enrich narrative poems with certain styles generally attributed to such genres as epic narratives, and the lyric. The lyric quality of the above passages is disclosed in the song element and also in the semantisizing emphasis on imagery. The heterodiegetic narrator of the above passages introduces insertions into his narrative that have the effect of interrupting coherence in the continuity of the story, but remain productive in terms of marking the text as authorial (heterodiegetic) narration. Taking the self-reflexive nature of some of these devices into consideration, and bearing in mind that extra textual phenomena such as genre, the reader, commentary, suspense, dialogue, flashbacks and flash-forwards etc. enter the text only through the authorial voice, the above passages bear obvious metanarrative traces with what Calinescu and Fokkema (1990: 220) describe as the extension of the extradiegetic frame. The functions of the above metanarrative devices are significant, leading the reader to see certain features or forms by which authorial narration manifests in poetry. A curious reader may interpret some of these metanarrative elements as a violation of the narrative norm that says a narrative text must tell a story causally towards a definite conclusion. Consequently, the introduction of the above metanarrative devices into the passages of narrative poems may seem problematic because they interrupt narrative. Yet, they are productive analytically, and in terms of marking a narrative situation as authorial. As a
further function, the lyricization of the above texts introduces a shift in the role of the speaker from narrating to poeticizing and commenting. The temporal change of role playing from narrating to providing commentary on the love affairs of Juan and Haideé does not however signal an introduction of a new speaker or narrator. Of importance is the fact that the metanarrative digressions or lyrics introduce a generic element into the narrative and tend to show what Byron adopted from 18th-century predecessors of both Romantic poetry and the novel to produce a new form of poetry—the verse narrative. As a functional effect, lyric and narrative commentary constitutes one way of characterizing authorial narration.

Another illustrative example of how metanarrative expressions can create grounds to discern a teller or narrator in conversation with a narratee, and allow for a construction of quite different functions including the interpretation of text as authorial heterodiegetic comes from “Don Juan”. The narrator’s commentary that accompanies long passages about Juan’s thoughts as he ‘wander’d by the glassy brooks/Thinking unutterable things (“Don Juan” I; XV) is worthy of note:

In thoughts like these true wisdom may discern  
Longings sublime, and aspirations high,  
Which some are born with, but the most part learn  
To plaque themselves withal, they know not why:  
’Twas strange that one so young should thus concern  
His brain about the action of the sky;  
If you think ’twas philosophy that this did,  
I can’t help thinking puberty assisted.  

(Byron, “Don Juan” I; XCIII)

The generalizations about ‘one so young’ yet endowed with a philosophical mind and knowledge about the ‘action of the sky’ is an indication of the authorial narrator’s presence and voice. Further functions may be constructed by considering the element of dialogue. Reading a text like the one above in the context of metanarration the most overt signals of extradiegetic narration are the self-reflexive indicators ‘I’ and ‘you’. In the above passage, the impression of an explicit narrator or teller addressing a reader is revealed in metanarrative interchange in the form of a dialogue between the narrator represented by ‘I’ and the person he addresses as ‘you’. One may presuppose that the extradiegetic narrator who identifies himself as ‘I’ is placed on the same extradiegetic level with his narratee designated by the ‘You’ to whom he is telling the story of Juan’s ‘sublime’ thoughts, ‘aspirations’, and philosophical endowments. The narrator’s commentary on Juan’s thoughts or ‘longings’ introduces certain aspects of general knowledge about wisdom and philosophy. The passage can thus be read as a story in which the extra textual element of thematizing is signaled by the assertion that
wisdom and genus are not only inborn tendencies, but are acquired in the learning process: ‘In thoughts like these true wisdom may discern/ Longings sublime, and aspirations high,/Which some are born with, but the most part learn’. Dialogue and commentary can thus serve as important extra textual metannarrative signals for authorial narration and omniscience. As a metanarrative digressive device, dialogue therefore introduces the function of making known ‘the persons of the outer communication level’ […], they primarily serve to create a trust–inducing conversation between the explicit narrator and the narratee, establishing their agreement about basic norms and values.\(^{209}\) The implicit underlying fact is the deliberate introduction of Romantic imagination in such words as ‘sublime’. Such implicit references to literary periods can only culminate in an understanding of ways narrative is linked to cultural history.

If one agrees with narratological thinking that narratives evoke the illusion of a reader; or that ‘the narrator’s references to his or her narratee on the discourse level also have a metanarrative character’ (Ansgar Nünning 2004a: 19), then the following metanarrative comments are illustrative signals for authorial narration:

> Why did she love him? Curious fool! Be still –
> Is human love the growth of human will?
> To her he might be gentleness; the stern
> Have deeper thoughts than your dull eyes discern,
> And when they love, your smilers guess not how
> Beats the strong heart, though less the lips avow.

*(Byron, “Lara” II: XXII)*

Any attempt to interpret the above passage in the context of metannarration aiming to locate the agent of mediation as authorial may take into consideration the narratee strategy. The apparent impression of the invocation of the reader (narratee) to whom the narrator is ‘presumably telling a story’ (cf. Marshall 1962) is suggested in the phrases ‘Curious fool’/your dull eyes and makes it possible to reconcile the fact that the narratyor in the outer communication level is addressing another agent - the narratee who is also situated outside the action. The narratee strategies are some most important corroborative indications that metanarrative elements differentiate and mark authorial (omniscience) narration.

\(^{209}\) Cf. Ansgar Nünning (2004a: 43). In an earlier analysis of the above passage Marshall (1962), had acknowledged the presence of a narrator presumably telling a story to himself, or to someone, but his terms are vaguely used and unthematised; in addition, he is neither concerned with narratological nor metanarrative implications that Ansgar Nünning (2004a: 44) attributes to Victorian novels.
To further illustrate the use of metanarrative strategy of narratees in staging authorial narration, I will again discuss an example from “Don Juan” (III; XL; XLI) in which the narrator draws attention to the reader in view of the feast thrown by Haidee and Juan that provokes Lambro’s surprise and astonishment:

Perhaps you think in stumbling on this feast  
He flew into a passion, and in fact  
There was no mighty reason to be pleased;  
Perhaps you prophesy some sudden act,  
The whip, the rack, or dungeon at the least,  
To teach his people to be more exact,  
And that, proceeding at a very high rate,  
He show’d the royal penchants of a pirate.

You’re wrong. - He was the mildest manner’d man  
That ever scuttled ship or cut a throat;  
With such true breeding of a gentleman,  
You never could divine his real thought;  
No courtier could, and scarcely woman can  
Gird more deceit within a petticoat;  
Pity he loved adventurous life’s variety,  
He was so great a loss to good society.

(Byron, “Don Juan” III; XL, XLI)

If one of the characteristics of metannarative is that the ‘authorial narrator is always ready to intervene him self between the reader and the story […]’ (Jahn 2005: N3.3.5); the statement can find illustration in the above passages in which the dialogue between the authorial heterodiegetic narrator and his addressee is more thematized and transparent. The narratee is signaled by ‘you’. Varied as the examples above may seem the analysis can link metannarrative phenomena to issues of genre, narration, narrative and extratextual clues such as thematizing and moralizing and hence stress the ways both the narrative and the novelistic tradition of the 18th c informed the composition of “Don Juan”. The above examples may help the reader to view the poem as a novel in verse in the light of Byron’s assertion quoted at the beginning of the study. The strategies which suggest the interpretation of the passages as authorial have the further function of allowing for an understanding of the narrative structures Byron’s poetry provides for the analysis of narration.

A further way of analyzing metannarration aiming to speak about its consequencies for the construction of narration as authorial is the use of narrative strategies that trigger the illusion of hypodiegetic levels. Its manifestations take many forms. A narrative subject may be split up, not only into the extradiegetic instances of the author, and the first-person narrator, but also into various intra- and hypodiegetic ones. The first-person character may come in as the intradiegetic narrator of an embedded text, and various hypodiegetic instances
(Calinescu and Fokkema 1990: 222). “Don Juan” again offers an illustrative example of this kind of narration. The story of Haidee is recollected and retold by Juan (on the diegetic level when the heterodiegetic narrator steps out temporarily) to other companions in the slave market as a frame tale, in which Juan himself, one of the characters in the story assumes the role of the intradiegetic narrator:

‘Tis not, said Juan, for my present doom
I mourn, but for the past;—I loved a maid’—
He paused, and his dark eye grew full of gloom;
[...]
‘Tis not my present lot, as I have said,
Which I deplore so much; for I have borne
Hardships [...].

(Byron, “Don Juan” V:XVIII)

In an earlier analysis of “Don Juan”, W. H. Marshall, interested in an examination of its structure, describes the poem as complex:

What then is left? Only the seeming myriads of speakers in the poem. For long sections [...], the narrative and its protagonist are abandoned. One after another, in sequence or in conflict, the various speakers emerge [...] on occasion two speakers may be juxtaposed [...]. (1962: 176)

The ‘Myriad of speakers’ is what accounts for the interpolation of metatexts in the narrative.

If psychonarration which is signaled by the capacity to have insight into other minds is another signal for authorial narration, then, “The Corsair” provides a lucid example. Excerpts from the poem can illustrate the authorial unlimited capabilities (omniscience) of insight into the mind of the protagonist Conrad and thus his/her voice. In the poem, several strategies serve to place emphasis on the omniscient authorial heterodiegetic narrator as the interpreter of the events from a position outside the story. The poem is a long narrative of about three cantos narrated from first to the third canto by a covert authorial voice. In rare instances does the narrator come out explicitly to disclose him/her self in self reflexive signals. In the first long Canto, it is the actions and thoughts of Conrad that are emphasized in story’s action verbs or sentences. One can find examples in such phrases as:

From crag to crag descending-swiftly sped
Stern Conrad down, nor once he turn’d his head;
He sees his bark, he notes how fair the wind,
And sternly gathers all his might of mind.
Again he hurries on-and as he hears
The clang of tumult vibrate on his ears,
The busy sounds, the bustle of the show,
The shout, the signal, and the dashing oar;
As marks his eye the seaboys on the mast
He marvell’d how his heart could seem so soft.
He feels all of his former self possest;
It is Conrad described in the third-person reference ‘he’, causing action or events that constitute the story and plot such as ‘sees’, ‘descending’, ‘turned’, ‘hurries’, ‘marvell’d’, and ‘feels’. In the second Canto of the poem, it is still Conrad disguised as a moslem begger to distract the attention of Seyd (in order that his forces may launch an attack unnoticed) whose mental and physical actions are emphasized:

He sate him down in silence, and his look
Resumed the calmness which before forsook:
The feast was usher’d in-but sumptuous fare
He shunn’d as if some poison mingled there.
Since far too early and too well obey’d,
The flame was kindled ere the signal made;
He saw their terror-from his baldic drew / His bugle-
He climbs the crackling stair-he bursts the door,
His breath choked gasping with the volume smoke,
But still from room to room his way he broke.
Conrad beheld the danger-
He deeply felt-what mortal hearts must feel,
For crimes committed, and the victor’s threat
Of lingering tortures to repay the debt-
He deeply, darkly felt

(IV; V; VI; VIII).

The reader will realize that the last canto of the poem in the last part of canto two (X) focuses exclusively on Conrad’s introspection during his moment of imprisonment. While the construction of the story is based on both physical events and thoughts of the protagonist discernible in the above lines in the verb ‘felt’, one can argue that such narrating verbs come into the texts of the poem through the external voice that can see into Conrad’s mind. One may also add that in the entire narrative, the protagonist is referred to by means of a third-person pronoun ‘he’, and at times by name ‘Conrad’. By means of devices, the narrator moves forward and backward in time linking actions to the perspective of the Conrad. He is a covertly depersonalized speaker at the heterodiegetic level of discourse and this gives him the unrestricted authority to take the reader to many different places- to Conrad’s mind or to the external setting’s especially where there is action. It is through the authorial narrator of these narrative poems that one gauges when the setting shifts from Pacha’s palace to Conrad’s mind especially in the prison scene. The connection between third-person reference ‘he’, the action verbs identified above and authorial narration is the fact that a narrative in which pronouns occur in the third-person, and the story focuses on the actions of the protagonist is likely to provide reliable factors for narratorial omniscience.
Turning to “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” for justification that narration is authorial (heterodiegetic), many examples can be cited. The narrator puts the hero in the diegesis, asserting knowledge of Harold’s Childhood and past; using the past tense of narration. It is through the narrator that the reader is informed of Harold’s childhood and delinquent or immoral life: ‘While in Albion’s isle there dwelt a youth, / Who ne in virtue’s ways did take delight’; / But spent his days in riot most uncouth, / Few earthly things found favour in his sight / Save concubines and carnal companie’ “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” (I: II). The narrator discloses that Harold had grown ‘aged’, not with ‘years’, but as a result of his deeds. Endowed with unrestricted omniscience, the narrator is able to discern in the mind of ‘Long absent HAROLD’, a feeling of one ‘Wrung with the wounds which kill not, but ne’er heal;’ (“Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” III: VIII). And because Harold took pleasure in morally depraving ills, the narrator judges and describes him as ‘ungodly’ in the Christian sense, hence summoning suppositions of personal judgement.210 Such an analysis can suggest the functions of the narrator as moralizer. The generalizations and digressions about Harold’s sins and infidelity are some important markers of omniscience authorial heterodiegetic narrator that cannot be ignored and of his functions as transmitter of information.

Even Childe Harold’s departure from his home land is reported by a voice external to the events, in fact the voice of one who has insights into Harold’s mood at the time of his departure: ‘The Childe departed from his father’s Hall’ (“Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” I; VII). ‘Yet oft-times in his maddest mirthful mood / Strange pangs would flash along Childe Harold’s brow / As if the memory of some deadly feud / Or disappointed passion lurk’d below; / But this none knew, nor happy cared to know’ (I; VIII). The first thing the reader notices is that the narrator not only reports about Harold’s mixed feelings and memories as the words ‘mirthful mood’, and ‘disappointed passion’ may suggest. The narrator also knows and reports about what the people knew and did not care to know: ‘But this none knew, nor happy cared to know;’ (I; VIII). One is likely to assume that a narrative in which the narrator claims to know what other characters know or do not know is likely to create the illusion of omniscience. In the preceding passages in which the narrator tells the reader about Harold’s feelings and mood of disappointment, solitude, sorrow, and grief, probably because ‘none did

210 Reacting to the first four stanzas of Childe Harold’s pilgrimage including those quoted above; (Jump 1972: 76) says that the temptation to identify Byron with the narrator cannot be averted; pointing out that Harold was the ‘version of himself that Byron was then able and willing to project in verse’. Jump’s claim that ‘in Cantos I and II we can sometimes be puzzled to know where the one ends and the other begins’ (77) can easily be challenged considering that linguistic clues in the first person ‘me’ and ‘I’ projects the authorial voice and therefore become the means by which Byron distances himself from the narrator of the poem.
love him’ (I; IX), there is no doubt that the voice one hears is that of an Omniscience heterodiegetic narrator in the third-person. What is immediately established in the analysis of the above lines is the narrator’s ability to understand Harold’s moods and feelings and hence, his superior knowledge. The very assertion the Harold is despaired with life and is hopeless is conveyed in the following lines: ‘Self-exiled Harold wanders forth again, / With nought of hope left, but with less of gloom; / The very knowledge that he lived in vain, / That all was over on this side the tomb’ (III; XVI). The lines contain expressions like ‘nought of hope’, and ‘knowledge that he lived in vain’ which all suggest emotional crises in Harold’s mind. Such phrases that take the reader into a character’s mind to disclose his/her feelings may constitute further smacks of authorial superior knowledge and can contribute significantly in marking narration as authorial heterodiegetic since only such a narrating agent can have access into another fictional mind’s thoughts and feelings.

In addition, the narrator’s ability to see into Harold’s mind and disclose his desire to live in the world of nature where he can meditate in quet ‘So deem’d the Childe, as o’er the mountains he / Did take his solitary guise’ “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” (I; XXVII) is pivotal for any discussions of authorial narration. The narrator once again is able to enter Harold’s mind and disclose to the reader his intensions (‘deem’d’) and desire for repentance from past sins. ‘Deemed’ appears to be a psychic event since it is a verb of intension and is link with authorial narration. Narratological convention requires that only an authorial narrator can have access into his/her protagonist’s inner life. While a verb of intension like ‘deem’d’in particular reveals the wishes or intensions of the character in the fictional world, the relation to authorial narration is that it illustrates the narrator’s unlimited authority and knowledge of other minds. Any mental verb that may signal unlimited cognition and knowledge prerogative is therefore a striking factor that can contribute to construct a narrative situation in Byron’s poetry as authorial.

The reader would also realize that the homodiegetic narrator we meet in the earlier Stanzas of Canto III of “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” (III; I; II; III; IV), is no longer the narrator as he has stepped out temporarily. The introduction of a different narrator in the authorial third-person voice is approximated by the introduction of a different narrative method that pervades canto I of the poem analyzed above. The heterodiegetic narrator, in the above lines, as in the earlier case, has turned attention to Harold; a character in the story telling about his emotional and physical life and actions from a position outside the story. He gives the impression once again that he knows about Harold’s intensions and state of mind as
suggested in verbs that express sorrows, feelings, pain, torture, misery and predicament. The narrator knows that Harold is psychologically tormented by an unnamed sin which ‘Still clung round him invisibly a chain / Which gall’d forever, fettering though unseen, / And heavy though it clank’d not; worn with pain, / Which pined although it spoke not, and grew keen, / Entering with every step he took through many a scene’ (“Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” III; IX). The impression conveyed when one attempts to analyze the above lines is that Harold is harboring within his mind an unnamed sin which constantly haunts him, the effects of which he is doomed to suffer all through his life. The comparism of Harold’s sin to a ‘chain’ which ‘clung round him invisibly’ to live with him ‘forever’ implies that a curse can pass through generations. Such a familiarity with knowledge that is denied other narrators (especially the homodiegetic narrator) can only show the extent to which the narrator of Childe Harold III is imbued with unlimited cognitive omniscience powers, as he narrates most of the time unobtrusively. On the part of the authorial narrator, the reader can construct his identity by means of markers analysed above. Further functions can be generic considering that the clues are capable of marking the text as narrative. On this point, and on the many other aspects of narration analyzed in the above poems, one can speak about Byron’s contribution to the creation of romantic narrative poetics, and therefore to literary culture, an emphasis that shows the plane on which Byron’ narrative verse reproduces cultures. When poetry becomes narrative as a result of its inculcation of the narrative tradition, its role in constructing narrative cannot be denied. Any attempt to construct an authorial narrator, and consequently determine the functions this narrating agent can make available as an interpretive and analytical device will thus take into consideration the narrator’s extra knowledge, extra textual markers, metanarrative devices, narratee signals, omniscience indicators and others mentioned above.
2. An Analysis of the Uses of First-Person Homodiegetic Narration in the Poetry of Lord Byron

A productive use of transgeneric theory of mediation that is important, first, for staging narration in particular and, second, for demonstrating the intersections of Byron’s narrative verse and specific cultures is the first-person homodiegetic narrative device. The question of representing voice whether personal or communal, of values and of the forms of voice by which narrative and cultures find representations have engaged, and is still a central issue in both narratology and cultural history, subsumed here in the richer blend of transgeneric narratology. Narratology engages questions of voice in its emphasis on structural aspects of story telling and mediating agents; culture amongst other issues pays attention to narrative, literary history, on subjects and values or identities of certain communities in their emphasis voice and thought strategies as forms of their representations. Hence the specific bond of connection characterizing these disciplines is the common engagement with narrativity and narrative voice. In other words, the question of how the intersections of Byron’s narrative verse and culture can be staged by means of narration is understood in my context to mean the ways by which the two disciplines engage with narrative (voice forms, thought mechanisms, and subjects of mediation as forms for reproducing or articulating both structural and context dimensions of texts). One significant way of staging narration in ways as yet unnoticed by transgeneric narratology, and which has failed to attract the attention of narrative reviewers on Byron’s poetry, is through the device of animals or culture-narrating objects reconceptualized in this study under communal voice. Adopting Lanser’s (1992: 21) definition, I use communal voice to analyze poems which reveal ‘a practice in which narrative authority is invested in a definable community and textually inscribed either through multiple, mutually authorizing voices or through the voice of a single individual who is manifestly authorized by a community’. Narration in both “The Prisoner of Chillon” and “Parisina” encourages our rendering of such texts in the manner described by Lanser as communal voice since the texts construct a narration which projects subjects as representations of discursive culture-specific traces. These poems and others will be analyzed here in many ways ranging from first, a singular from in which one narrator speaks for a Collective in a typical homodiegetic style, a simultaneous form in which a ‘plural we’ (Lanser 1992: 22), who apparently speaks for a collective or narrates in the typical homodiegetic form of the experiencing ‘I’ and the narrating ‘I’. My analysis is geared towards achieving two objectives;
namely- staging narration; and also linking Byron’s narrative verse to specific cultures it attempts to reproduce by narrative means as a secondary goal.

Before we turn to analysis, it may be important to remind the readers that in a restricted sense, earlier narratological analysis of some of the poems under study has not satisfactorily answered the question of how Byron’s poetry can provide strategies for constructing narrative meaning and to an extent, specific cultures. Although W. H. Marshall (1962: 82) is more concerned with analyzing the structure of “The Prisoner of Chillon”, his emphasis on reading the poem as a dramatic monologue is based on ‘the prisoner’s interpretation of his own experience’, hence, he does not appear to raise the question of who the narrator of the poem is. The important question of the type of narration that constructs a narrator who speaks about his own experiences has not yet been answered. Jane Kirchner (1973: 57) goes further than Marshall in her reading of the poem as a ‘monologue’ told by a narrator, with a focus on ways of creating the personality of the prisoner, what she calls the Byronic hero, who is the interpreter of his own experiences. The fact that the story of the prisoner is recounted by a narrator who is himself the protagonist cannot be doubted. Yet the question left unanswered by the readings above, and which the study attempts, is how this narrator’s identity is conceptualized in narratological terms, and of his/her forms of textual manifestations and functions especially when issues of narrative and contexts are concerned.

In arguing that narration can be considered to be a very important way of generating cultural meaning, we would also be suggesting that the way Byron constructs his narration is highly culture specific and fits our understanding of transgeneric narratology. To the extent that Byron’s poems written in the first-person offer linguistic devices for constructing homodiegetic narration, we would also be saying that the said poetry constitute an arena for constructing narrative meaning in a discipline that has traditionally been viewed as lyrical and anti narrative. We now turn to analysis.

My starting point for an investigation into the uses that can be made of first-person homodiegetic narration in Byron’s poetry is communal voice. “The prisoner of Chillon” provides a testing ground for this concept because in its focus on narration and issues dealing with historical, political and ideological implications, the poem supplies narratological evidence for representing homodiegetic narration and particular historical and political circumstances discernible in Byron’s poetry. A typical example is the last stanza of the poem whose manner of narrating suits our understanding of the ways the narrative verse can reproduce contexts by narrative means:
It might be months, or years, or days,  
I kept no count-I took no note,  
I had no hope my eyes to raise,  
And clear them of their dreary mote;  
At last men came to set me free,  
I ask’d not why, and reck’d not where.  
It was at length the same to me,  
Fetter’d or fetterless to be,  
I learn’d to love despair.  
And thus when they appear’d at last,  
And all my bonds aside were were cast,  
These heavy walls to me had grown  
A hermitage-and all my own!  
And half I felt as they were come  
To tear me from a second home:  
With spiders I had friendship made,  
And watch’d them in their sullen trade,  
Had seen the mice by moonlight play,  
And why should I feel less than they?  
We were all inmates of one place,  
And I, the monarch of each race,  
Had power to kill-yet, strange to tell!  
In quiet we had learn’d to dwell-  
My very chains and I grew friends,  
So much a long communion tends  
To make us what we are:-even I  
Regain’d my freedom with a sigh.

(Byron, “The Prisoner of Chillon” XIV, In: Pocock 1948: 360)

If the reader has a way of knowing, with any degree of certainty, how communal voice enters “The prisoner of Chillon” and characterizes narration as homodiegetic, it is by means of the references ‘I’ and ‘we’. The poem creates conditions for saying ‘I’ and ‘We’ by the same persona who appears to be representing the colonised community of the subjugated and the oppressed in which animals form a part. To open up such a discussion, one point of great significance is that characters in “The Prisoner of Chillon” like those in “Parisina” exist within a cultural context, and are constructed by means of language, linguistic evidence and voice or objects to represent these contexts. In “The Prisoner of Chillon”, it is apparently the colonised or marginalised community that is represented; while in “Parisina” it is the legal context. Questions of collective identity are inherently implied in these two poems and are inextricably linked to telling stories since characters experience themselves in story telling elements that may help in constructing narrative and contexts. As will be shown, animals or objects can be transformed into literary or linguistic subjects by endowing them with a diegetic identity in the form of ‘We’. In attempting to use narrative forms such as ‘I’ and ‘We’ to construct post colonial culture, and to show the ways post colonial subjects perceive themselves, we would be answering the question of the intersections between Byron’s poetry
and cultures, since the construction of culture and the construction of post colonial subjects are inextricably linked to the notion of narrative.

If one considers that narrative is also produced by cognitive elements, then cognitive metaphors may be important devices for staging homodiegetic narration in this study. I propose to use ‘Empire metaphor’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 70), (Nünning 2005: 7) as an indispensable cognitive or even extrarepresentational narrative tool for narrating as well as reproducing both homodiegetic narration and cultural historical issues of colonialism and the colonised historical subjects in the poetry under study. “The Prisoner of Chillon” is a poem which makes me see in theory and practice what Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffins (2000: 220) mean when they assert that in post colonial oriented writing, the human subject is ‘[re]produced’ by means of ‘ideology, discourse or language’. I am particularly intrigued by the last passage of the poem (“The Prisoner of Chillon”: XIV) which contains strategies which are cognitive and linguistic like language (metaphors) and voice for speaking about both narrative and post colonial ideologies and its related issues of colonizer and the colonized, subject and subjectivity, imprisonment and power. The metaphor of the British Empire as the centre and that of the colonised as the ‘second home’ or periphery (which often feature in most post colonial writing) is particularly useful here. The metaphor of the ‘second home’ creates grounds for an understanding of the relationship between colonial power and the colonised which is also linked to master-servant relationship. The colonial master is traditionally attributed absolute authority- a ‘monarch’ with the ‘power to kill’ his subjects who are creatures (spiders and mice). Since the colonised or animals are under the dominion of the ‘monarch’, the metaphor of the second home appears to suggest a link between the imperial power and the colonised, and by extension a relationship of ‘political hegemony’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 70) and subjection or master and servant. Issues of colonialism and the colonised are thus brought into the poem by means of the images of the monarch (‘I’) and second home. The monarch identifies himself as master by means of the linguistic device ‘I’ which suggest that he/she is in the fictional world. Further, a relationship of the center and the periphery vividly illustrates the fact that both linguistic reference and metaphors can reproduce socio-cultural issues like the relationship between the British Empire and her colonise. The metaphor of the monarch and his second home also has ideological implications as it reproduces a relationship of power and subjection. “The Prisoner of Chillon” begins in a typical homodiegetic style, in which the protagonist names him/herself as ‘me’ and ‘I’. The
narrator is recounting the story of his experiences in prison\textsuperscript{211}. Narration alternates from ‘I’ to ‘we’ but this has a significance in the construction of communal voice that links the said poetry to postcolonial culture. When the protagonist (narrating subject) sees himself or herself as an individual, he or she uses ‘I’. When he sees himself as a collective identity, he uses the ‘we’ form. An instance is when the narrator switches from the ‘I’ to ‘We’ especially when he declares that he has made friendship with Spiders and Mice, an assertion which he justifies by the ‘we’ pronoun reference. What is apparent is the construction of a ‘we’ narrative situation in which the agents are constituted by a human being and Spiders and Mice. The spiders and mice are also narrating subjects in a sense. They are objects endowed with voice by means of the ‘we’ linguistic strategy in which they are personalized. They thus become textual agents in the process of cultural construction of meaning. The fact that the form in which cultural creatures are represented moves from ‘I’ to the inclusive ‘We’ is also significant. The use of the ‘We’ form need not create the impression of the presence of a group of people narrating at the same time. It is rather a single voice representing a collective in the sense that the narrator uses ‘We’ when he visualizes himself as speaking for a community of slaves. The marginalized community epitomized in the animal-object image is contained in the voice that narrates ‘we’; hence the community or its identity becomes a form of language. In other words, the poem creates conditions for saying ‘I’, ‘me’ and ‘we’ by the oppressed who are both human beings and animals, but given a linguistic voice. The poem attempts to create a community as a prison house of subjugation (Lanser 1992) and imprisonment. Such a reading would imply conceiving of identity in terms of a collective. The poem is therefore a place where one sees a link between the poetry under study and postcolonial culture. This is a link that is so apparent, yet has not been articulated by reviews of Byron’s poetry.

A striking aspect for speaking about the ways Byron’s poetry constructs narrative meaning and cultural contexts is the use the personalized reference ‘I’ in the same homodiegetically narrated text “The Prisoner of Chillon”. I will use the ‘I’ narrative strategy to illustrate one way ideology (post colonialism, issues of power and authority, subject, race, subjectivity) is contained in narratorial voice aiming to show that narrative is the medium for constructing issues of context that are often linked to colonial discourse such as subject,

\textsuperscript{211} The illusion that the narrator is telling the story of his life has been commented upon by Elledge (1968: 45) who notes that the narrative poem is the narrative of a proud, garrulous and self indulgent oldman who satisfies the demand of his ego by telling, and vicariously relieving, a crisis in his history [...]. Such a comment not only foregrounds a narrative effect but also necessitates the further question of what type of history.
subjectivity, imprisonment, slavery, race and power. The passage is about slavery and incarceration of an inmate who is imprisoned for his religious beliefs. In the sentences that read:

These heavy walls to me had grown
A hermitage—and all my own!
And half I felt as they were come
To tear me from a second home,
With spiders I had friendship made,
[...]
We were all inmates of one place,
And I, the monarch of each race,
Had power to kill—yet, strange to tell!


The personal pronouns—me, and I are important for an interpretation of the poem as directly linked to post colonial issues of the colonizer and the colonized, subject and subjectivity, power and authority. The notion of colonizer, colonial power and subjectivity enters the text my means of the ‘I’ homodiegetic narrative strategy. The passage of power from slave to ‘Monarch’ is signified by the ‘I’ linguistic device. The sentences that read: ‘With spiders I had friendship made, / We were all inmates of one place, / And I, the monarch of each race, / Had power to kill’ show the image of a prisoner as a ‘Monarch’ with unlimited authority including the power to kill his subjects who are animals. The image of the Monarch arrogating to himself absolute authority and rights to ‘a second home’, ‘a race’, and subjects has a significant relationship to the discourse of post colonialism. What the reader sees is colonial power although exerted by a prisoner. When the narrator says he is a monarch, has a second home, a race, ‘all [his] own’ and subjects which he can kill; ideological issues such as power, political dominance, subject and subjectivity are invoked as implicit references to colonialism. Further, the prisoner himself had served many years in prison and now dreads freedom because that would be tantamount to loosing the colony, power, authority and hegemony he has acquired over his subjects. Moreover, the narrating ‘I’ describes the prison as a ‘race’, ‘A hermitage all my own!’ This implies that he visualizes himself as symbol of power, probably the colonizer—‘the monarch of each race’, endowed with the power to kill his subjects who are animals—the Mice and Spiders. He is thus a kind of substructure in the hierarchy analogous to the Colonizer-Britain and her colonies. The description of the prison as a ‘race’ with a Monarch at the helm of power, that can kill his dehumanized subjects (animals) is vital in determining how the colonizers and colonized view each other, how they speak, how post colonial subjects are reproduced in Byron’s poetry, and also invoke Spivak’s question of
whether the ‘silenced’, ‘margins’, or ‘oppressed’ ‘can speak’? (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffins: 25).

The issue of human identification with animals is also significant in answering the question of whose voice or perspective is represented, (and by whom) in an apparently post colonial oriented poem like the one in question—the colonizer or the colonized? The homodiegetic narrator temporarily assumes a communal voice and speaks for the collective and apparently marginalized community of slaves and prisoners who are also animals. The subjects view themselves as animals, apparently the subordinate or the margins, and thus define themselves in relation to animals or the dehumanized. The animal image becomes a symbol for the identity of the exploited, or the voiceless. They are merely represented and not heard. The poem can thus be read as a linguistic or narrative representation of post-colonial silenced communities where subjects are dehumanized (voiceless, imprisoned, and valued as nothing beyond animals) and also has ideological connotations as it reproduces the crucial issue of political dominance often associated with colonialism.

While the relationship between those in power and the oppressed is epitomized in post colonial as well as transgeneric narratology, and may signalize Byron’s response to colonialism, the ‘I’ appears to be a symbol of Foucault’s notion of power. Foucault did not write about post colonialism but his views on power are influential in the analysis of colonialism in the poem under study. In Foucault’s understanding of power, discourse and language are linked to social issues in the same way as in narrative construction of cultures, issues of identity, post colonial ideologies, power, authority, slave and slavery are inextricably linked to linguistic evidence. And if linguistic representation provides channels for constructing power, power could be said to be linked to social practices like colonization as one finds the narrator assuming authority (in the same way as Britain perceives herself in relation to her empires as the centre) and speaking for another person perceived as animals who are voiceless. Modes of cultural expressions where power is made manifest in the poem are human/animals, ways of talking, judging, language, and norms. In order to reproduce a pattern of power, the narrator creates an apparently sub cultural context which actually reproduces the same pattern of power. When freedom finally comes the narrator rejects it and only accepts it with a sigh because accepting it would deprive him of power and authority over his subjects and new colony or race he/she has acquired. Secondly, power is created in language because the narrator speaks for the subjects. In other words, even though the narrator himself is subjected, he constructs a new kind of identity by subjugating his subjects,
and speaking for them, and in so doing he reproduces a system of power. Access to language, authority and representation becomes a form of power. Since he can speak, has a colony, and subjects, he wails power just like the British Imperial powers. Byron’s manner of narrating encourages the impression that he is making a critique of colonial power. Since the narrating subject is apparently constructed by language, since he epitomizes the imperialist ideology, and granted that issues of imprisonment, subjects, subjugation, race, colonize, colonizer and voicelessness have an enormous influence on the formation of imperial ideology, the very parameters can account for the function of voice in introducing issues of post colonial culture in the poetry of Byron. Further, the fact that the narrating ‘I’ is the one causing the action that is narrated also contributes to enhance an understanding of the way Byron’s poetry creates homodiegetic narration as a functional effect.

An important device that may be relevant for staging narration as first-person homodiegetic category, which is also crucial for accounting for my hypothetical claim that Byron’s poetry can construct narrative is the linguistic device- ‘I’. It seems important to engage in an investigation of the forms and functions of homodiegetic narration with a study of the narrator of Byron’s “The Prisoner of Chillon”. The poem is a monologue typical of the traditional autobiographical fiction, and hence offers an opportunity for investigating the various manifestations of this device. The dramatic monologue\textsuperscript{212} is narrated from the first to the last stanza in the first-person voice. Unlike most first-person texts in which the narrating ‘I’ may just be a witness (I-as-witness) in the story events, the ‘I’ of “The Prisoner of Chillon” is the protagonist of his story, and since his narration is about events he himself witnessed a long time in the past, he is both the narrating ‘I’ and the experiencing ‘I’ (that is not, however, to imply that narration is simultaneouse with telling).

The strategy (‘I’) is necessary here because it becomes an important tool in staging homodiegetic narration and his/her potential functions in the analysis of Byron’s poem. The story is told by the protagonist himself, which means that the external perspective is abandoned.\textsuperscript{213} In an earlier narratological interpretation of the poem, Kirchner (1973: 18) describes the poem as a ‘monologue’ narrated by the narrator, the protagonist, adding that there is another possible level which suggests Byron’s identification with his heroes. Kirchner’s categories such as the protagonist appear to give more emphasis to the conception

\textsuperscript{212} On the question of the use of dramatic monologue in “The Prisoner of Chillon”, (Elledge 1968: 46) also argues that the ‘dramatic monologue’ is based on isolation and ‘neurotic introspection’.

of the ‘persona’ who appears in differing forms - the narrator, the poet, and the Byronic hero. Such an interpretation only let the reader see the point of departure of the present from Kirchner’s.

The linguistic device ‘I’ itself is one way of accounting for homodiegetic narration and also self narration since the homodiegetic narrator recounts the events that he had witnessed personally. Thus he makes the point clear that he is telling his own story (“The Prisoner of Chillon” (III-XIV)). Numerous devices drawn from the above stanzas are relevant in staging narration in the first person. Narration or monologue is recounted in a typical autobiographical first-person mode, with the narrator revealing his identity as protagonist and narrating I, in such linguistic references as ‘I’ ‘me’, ‘mine’ and ‘we’. The device of homodiegetic narration in the first person identifies the narrator as a character in the story and becomes the dominant technique used in the poem and links the speaker to all the action-oriented events in the poem. In contradistinction to authorial narrators in third-person texts, the narrator is one of the characters in the story he is telling; hence narration is restricted to the ‘internal processes, thought, and feelings of the narrating ‘I’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 112). The example of stanzas I, which provides evidence that the narrating ‘I’ is found in almost all plot oriented sentences not only set the scene for homodiegetic narration; the character-narrator makes clear that he/she is telling the story of his life in the manner of autobiographical narration. In the opening stanza (I), the autodiegetic narrator recalls the conditions that produced his ‘grey’ ‘hairs’, ‘bowed’, ‘limbs’, and broken spirit (Elledge 1968: 46). ‘My hair is grey, but not with years, / Nor grew it white, / In a single night, / My limbs are bow’d, / For they have been the fate of those / To whom the goodly earth and air / Are bann’d, and barr’d.’ Such a start which places the speaker in the action of the story as he recounts his deprivation from ‘goodly earth and air’, the chains, and the personally-endured sufferings because he has been imprisoned (‘bann’d and barr’d’), seems to provide evidence of the narrator’s attempt to situate his narration in a typical first-person homodiegetic style.

The idea that narration is homodiegetic, recounted by the narrator who is the protagonist at the same time continues to receive evidence in the subsequent phases, beginning with the narrator coming out obtrusively and naming himself in a profusion of linguistic references as ‘I’. Narration in the fragment appears to trigger the important question of the textual manifestations of homodiegetic narration and functions. The passage in which the narrator consciously stresses the duration and intensity of his own sufferings, through description of the confinement and death of his father and brothers, back to the image .of
himself in isolation (cf. Marshall 1962: 83) may support my claim that narration in the text is homodiegetic and recounted in the first-person reference ‘I’:

We were seven-who now are one,
Six in youth and one in age,
Finish’d as they had begun,
Proud of persecution’s rage;
One in fire and two in field,
Their belief with blood have seal’d:
Dying as their father died,
For the God their foes denied:-
Three were in a dungeon cast,
Of whom this wreck is left the last.


Here is an example of a first-person narrator whose actions and thoughts (in a lonely cell) constitute the basis of the development of the story. Drawing on the deictic of time and place signalized by ‘now’; on the speaker’s familiarity with the members of his family; and the nature of their deaths; the impression created is that personal experience can become the basis of constructing a first-person homodiegetic narration in Byron’s poem.

In the same way the linguistic ‘I’ functions, a similar example is that of mixed mode narration that creates the impression of many story characters narrating at once, and hence suggests another way Byron provided narrative means for constructing homodiegetic narration in poetry. In the following analysis, I will examine the two forms and show that they are both important for the identification, interpretation and analysis of the poem as first-person (homodiegetic) as well as for constructing meaning. My first example that appears to suggest a homodiegetic voice comes from the first passage of the poem and is indicated by ‘we’ linguistic form. The alteration between ‘we’ and ‘I’ forms of narration, and their significance in rendering a narrative situation in both the first-person homodiegetic and authorial (heterodiegetic) becomes clear when one analyses the poem “The Siege of Corinth”. Evidence that the ‘we’ individualized reference can be a form by which homodiegetic narration (experiencing self) enters poem and allows for a construction of meaning is supplied by a passage from the poem recounting the adventures of a group of people across the mountain:

In the year since Jesus died for men,
Eighteen hundred years and ten,
We were a gallant company,
Riding o’er land, and sailing o’er sea.
Oh! but we went merrily!
We forded the river, and clomb the high hill,
Never our steeds for a day stood still;
Our sleep fell soft on the hardest bed;
Whether we couch’d in our rough capote,
On the rougher plank of our gliding boat,
Or stretch’d on the beach, or our saddles spread
As a pillow beneath the resting head,
Fresh we woke upon the morrow:
All our thoughts and words had scope,
We had health, and we had hope,
Toil and travel, but no sorrow.
We were of all tongues and creeds;-
Some were those who counted beads,
Some of mosque, and some of church,
And some, or I mis-say, of neither;
[...]
But some are dead, and some are gone,
And some are scatter’d and alone,
And some are rebels on the hills

(Byron, “The Siege of Corinth”. In: Pocock 1948: 304)

One most prominent indicator that the voice the reader hears is in the first-person homodiegetic mode recounting a story of personal experience is the use of the ‘we’ and also ‘I’ form that occurs many times in the above passage. The story is constructed on the actions and experiences of the speaking subject. To adopt the words of Jahn (2005: N31.5), is the fact that most ‘story related action sentences’ contain first-person collective pronoun (‘we’ and ‘I) forms. This claim can be illustrated by such expressions as ‘We were a gallant company / riding over lands, sailing over sea / We went merrily! / forded / clomb the high hill, / We lay / We couch’d / We woke.’ The expressions cited above which constitute what Jahn (2005: N31.6) calls ‘the story’s plain action sentences’ all present the pilgrimage and activities of riding, sailing, lying, and sleeping involving the narrator and the other characters in the story. Since the action-verbs suggest the presence of the experiencing ‘we’ or ‘I’ (Jahn 2005: N31.6) in the fictional world, the impression created is that narration is rendered in the homodiegetic voice, and that he/she participated in the events he/she is recounting. This kind of narration fits our understanding of homodiegetic narration.

Further evidence supporting the claim that “The Prisoner of Chillon” cited above is an account of personal experience can be found in the detailed and familiar description of the dungeon, with visual emphasis suggested by the expressions ‘grey’, ‘old’, and massy:

There are seven pillars of Gothic mould,
In Chillon’s dungeons deep and old,
There are seven columns massy and grey,
Dim with a dull imprison’d ray,
A sunbeam which hath lost its way,
And through the crevice and the cleft:
Of the thick wall is fallen and left:
And in each pillar there is a ring,
And in each ring there is a chain;
That iron is a cankering thing,
For in those limbs its teeth remain,
With marks that will not wear away
Till I have done with this new day,
Which now is painful to these eyes,
Which have not seen the sun so rise
For years- I cannot count them o’er,
I lost their long and heavy score
When my last brother droop’d and died,
And I lay living by his side.

(Byron, “The Prisoner of Chillon”: II. In: Pocock 1948: 351)

The ‘grey’ and ‘dim’ would suggest total darkness in a prison cell where the narrator is incarcerated and deprived of light. There are indicators that the narrator is inside the story and not external in the manner of authorial narration. The narrator recalls his laborious activity of creeping on the cold prison floor. In the midst of darkness, the speaker notices a ‘figure of sunlight penetrating cold and darkness’ /, ‘A sunbeam which hath lost its way, / And through the crevice and the cleft:’ (Elledge 1968: 47). The visual imagery in the line: ‘A sunbeam which hath lost its way’, which one finds again in stanza three: ‘we could not see/ But with that pale and livid light/, That made us strangers in our sight’ (III) are further clues that the narrator was present on the scene of events and now recounts a story of personal experience. As further indicators, the “auditory figures” (Elledge 1968: 48) emphasized in the phrases: ‘hearken to each other’s speech’, ‘recite some legend old’ and also in their voices which ‘took a dreary tone, / an echo of the dungeon stone’,214 ‘With some new hope or legend old, / Or song heroically bold; / Our voices took a dreary tone / A grating sound-not full and free / They never sounded like our own’ (III) are also important to justify that the narrator was a character in the scene of the events he is recounting. Such linguistic devices are important for constructing first-person homodiegetic narration in poetry.

One further way of depicting homodiegetic narration and its uses is by determining whether the narrator is in the fictional world, placed in the diegetic setting as the protagonist. The use of action verbs may be of help here. Beginning from the third stanza, narration in “The Prisoner of Chillon” (III) is sustained in the ‘we’ and ‘us’ linguistic markers and is still about the experiences of the protagonist. The narrator recalls and narrates the story of events he witnessed in prison creating the impression of the presence of other linguistic subjects in the fictional world:

They chained us each to a column stone,
And we were three- yet, each alone;
We could not move a single pace,
We could not see each other’s face,

214 See Elledge, (1968: 48), for this analysis.
But with that pale and livid light
That made us strangers in our sight:
[...],
Fetter’d in hand, but joined in heart,
’T was still some solace, in the dearth
Of the pure elements of earth,
To hearken to each other’s speech,
An each turn comforter to each

(Byron, “The Prisoner of Chillon”: III. In: Pocock 1948: 352)

The first conspicuous signal that narration is homodiegetic is noticed in action verbs like ‘chained’ and ‘fetter’d’ that suggest the narrator’s involvement in action: ‘They chained us to a column stone / Fetter’d in hand / ‘This new day, now is painful to these eyes’. Reacting to the above stanza, Marshall (1962: 85) sees not only ‘emotional stress’, but notes also that silence is to become an outward sign of his [the prisoner narrator’s] ordeal’. The narrator’s active involvement in the plot of the story is further strengthened by the impression that the narrative voice is indubitably homodiegetic. Many supportive clues can be identified in the above stanza. Besides the profusion of first-person references such as ‘us’, ‘we’, and ‘our’, it is important to note the many other instances where attention is directed to personal experience: ‘They chained us to a column stone / Fetter’d in hand / That iron is a cankering thing / For in these limbs it’s teeth remain, / With marks that will not wear away’ (II; III).215 In the narrator’s assertion that ‘this new day, now is painful to these eyes, / which have not seen the sun to rise, / the speaker appears, at least in conformity with his utterances in the first stanza’ (Marshall 1962: 84), to suggest that he is presenting a personal story. The narrator’s participation in such activities as story telling about some old legend, singing; and his impression that these actions were a source of solace, not only place him in the fictional world but can be further contextual clues that he is telling the story of his own life. Further instances in which the reader may rely on the linguistic signal ‘I’ as the privileging strategy in homodiegetic narration are analyzed in the following narrating fragments from “The Prisoner of Chillon” about the dying moment of the speaker’s brother: ‘His spirit withered with their clank. / I saw it silently decline- / But I yet I forced it on to cheer / (V); I said my nearer brother pined, / I said his mighty heart declined, / Our bread was such as captives’ tears / I saw and could not hold his head’ (VII). Like wise in the description of Lake Leman (IV), the narrator makes his identity and his feelings central to his narration:

We heard it ripple night and day;
Sounding o’er our heads it knocked;

215 See also M.H. Marshall’s (1962: 84) analysis of these lines.
And I have felt the winter’s spray
Wash through the bars when winds were high
And wanton in the happy sky;
And then the very rock hath rock’d
And I have felt it shake, unshock’d,
Because I could have smiled to see
The death that would have set me free.

(Byron, “The Prisoner of Chillon”: II. In: Pocock 1948: 354)

Drawing on the profusion of ‘I’s in the story, and on verbs that make the narrator’s actions and feelings central to narration including ‘heard’, and ‘felt’, one can again assume that the narrating voice is in the first-person and thus homodiegetic. This means that reader may consider the use of ‘I’ and also features that suggest that narration is an account of personal experiences which consist of physical torments, deprivations and afflictions (Kirchner 1973: 5) when interpreting the above text as homodiegetic. As a functional effect, this type of narration that provide supporting clues that the narrator is a character in the story may encourage an interpretation that Byron’s poetry provides narrative features for constructing what narrative theory (Rivara 2004) recognizes as life writing or fictions of autobiography.

The device of unreliability, which is important in rendering a poem as homodiegetic, is inherent in stanza V and others of the poem. An example can be found in the following lines which is a description of the physical strength and firmness of spirit of one of the characters: ‘The other was as pure of mind; / Which ‘gainst the world in war had stood, / With joy: - / His spirit wither’d with their clank. / I saw it silently decline- / But yet I forced it on to cheer / To him the dungeon was a gulf And fettered feet the worst of ills.’ The description of the mind of one of the characters as ‘pure’ would suggest the narrator’s insight into the psychological and moral components of other minds. The association of omniscience with ‘I’ is marker of unreliability since first-person narrators are narratologically denied knowledge and cognitive authority.

The following expressions contain clues that would identify a text as omniscience and create the impression of a first-person narrator who knows the minds of other characters in the story: ‘his spirit wither’d with their clank / I saw it silently decline / (V), we heard it [lake Leman] ripple night and day; (VI) / he (my brother) loathed and put away his food; / it was a foolish thought, / but then within my brain it wrought, / (III), but he, the favourite and the flower, / the infant lore of all his race, / his matyr’d father’s dearest thought, / and grieved for those he left behind’. In the description of the bird which visits the speaker in prison, the narrator says that it ‘was not half so desolate’ (X). ‘Loathed’ would describe emotions, ‘thought’ and ‘heard’ are mental activities while ‘desolate’ is a psychological state of mind.
The verbs and adjective analysed suggest the narrator’s ability to have an insight into the minds, emotions and mental states of other story characters. The reader may be tempted to wonder the kind of narrator that knows and describes another character’s emotions, psychic activities and feelings as conveyed in the verbs ‘we heard’ and ‘loathed’. Again, the impression that the bird does not feel ‘desolate’ may be the portrayal of the bird’s imagination in the narrator’s words. What I am drawing attention to is the fact that the homodiegetic narrator of the poem has an insight into the states of mind of both humans and creatures and recounts them, a prerogative that narratology denies homodiegetic narrators. The further description of Lake Leman in stanza VI as ‘A thousand feet in dept below’ suggests unlimited physical authority but serves as a further contradiction with the narrator’s position as participant or character inside the story. This claim is supported in two instances: firstly, the narrator himself acknowledges his cognitive limitations when he shows a lack of knowledge of the motives behind the bird’s decision to visit him in prison by deploying ‘seemed’: ‘A lovely bird, it seemed like me to want a mate’ (X). Notice that he employs the speculative cognitive verb ‘seem’ so as to suggest his cognitive limitations. The impression of lack of knowledge authority is again suggested when the ‘I’ narrating agent reports the predicament of his experiencing self after the death of his brother: ‘what next befell me then and there / I know not well, I never knew-’ (IX). I am drawing the reader’s attention to the fact that in some instances in his/her narration, the narrator deploys indicators that suggest lack of insight into other character’s mental states; at times he/she uses words that create the impression of omniscience and thus make narration contradictory. Such phrases that draw the reader’s attention to other character’s or object’s thoughts, attitudes or mental states would leave the reader with an impression of ‘parallipsis’ or transgressive (deviant) narration since the ability to enter into others minds and recount their feelings is the exclusive prerogative of an authorial (heterodiegetic or omniscient) narrator. Omniscience is a privilege denied first-person narrators who are usually placed on the story level with other characters.

Narrative devices pertaining to the representation of self-narration are instrumental for discussions of homodiegetic narration and its functions in Byron’s poetry. While narratological convention points out that autobiographical narrative raises a problem which results from ‘inherent duality’ and which is made more complex ‘by the dissociation of the time of narration and the time of the events narrated’ (Rivara 2004: 102-103), one pivotal element which is significant for the staging of homodiegetic narration is dissonant self-narration. “The Prisoner of Chillon” again provides a staging ground for this device. Retrospective techniques are important for the reproduction of the first-person narrator’s past
consciousness and, consequently, for marking him/her (Cohn 1978: 144). Phrases like ‘Till I have done with this new day, / Which now is painful to the eyes, / I lost their long and heavy score’ (“The Prisoner of Chillon” II) are sufficient to mark the distance between the time of utterance and the moment of experience when the protagonist was imprisoned. What separates the present narrating voice from the past time ‘I’ is the deictic frame ‘now’. The temporal distance is also signaled by the fact that the narrator has grown old and blind: ‘For years - I cannot count them o’er, / I lost their long and heavy score’ (“The Prisoner of Chillon” II). Similarly, the narrator’s statement that ‘[…] he, the favorite and the flower, / Most cherish’d since his natal hour, / for whom I sought / To hoard my life, that his might be / Less wretched now, and one day free’ (“The Prisoner of Chillon” VIII) is likely to be interpreted as dissonant self-narration because the deictic ‘now’ separates the present moment of narration from the years the narrator lived and witnessed the youthful days of his younger brother. I am drawing the reader’s attention to the fact that in autobiographical poems that reproduce the narrator’s past life retrospectively, any assessment of his/her presence in the events would be signaled by deictics.

A profusion of psychoanalogies is another indicator that lends credence to any interpretation of the story of imprisonment as homodiegetic narration. Besides the speaker’s account of his prison experiences which consist of physical and psychological torments, the narrator goes back in time to recollect one of his most painful emotional experiences, the death of his brother whom he describes in beautiful psychoanalogies:

I was the eldest of the three,
And to uphold and cheer the rest
I ought to do-and did my best-
And each did well in his degree.
The youngest, whom my father loved,
Because our mother’s brow was given
To him-with eyes as blue as heaven,
For him my soul was sorely moved:
And truly might it be distressed
To see such bird in such a nest;

(Byron, “The Prisoner of Chillon”: IV. In: Pocock 1948: 353)

The death of the favorite brother, the ‘flower’ (VIII), had the emotional impact of stress on the narrator. The image of this brother is, from the point of view of the narrator a ‘flower’. This may suggest love and tenderness. Apart from being the favorite and the ‘flower, / ‘whom my father loved,’ the brother is depicted in attributes of light, beauty, innocence, purity, and tenderness. He was a ‘bird in […] a nest; / with eyes as blue as heaven’; he was beautiful as ‘a polar day, / a snow-clad offspring of the sun; / as pure and bright’ (IV). The comparison of the
brother to elements of nature is a psychoanalogical support for the fact that narration is constructed from personal experience.

Further ways by which the narrator constructs his story on events of personal experience, and by means of psychoanalyses, tactile and audible images feature in stanza VI of “The Prisoner of Chillon”. This is evident in his/her comparison of the waters of Lake Leman to a living grave. Here, water is linked in metaphorical references to wild winds knocking the ‘heads’ and shaking the rocks, and appears to be an imagistic depiction of the physical and the psychologically turbulent life the narrator is experiencing in his prison cell. The verbs of hearing and feeling describing the sound of echoes from Lake Leman and the impressions the sound awakens in the narrator – ‘death […] would have set me free’ - conjure up the impression that we are reading a story of someone’s personal experiences constructed in his own voice. The narrator is thus identified as one of the characters in the story.

The seventh stanza in which the narrator recounts their predicament and the very pathetic experience conveyed in imagery associated with tears, hunting and animal imagery, also suggests homodiegetic narration and create further convincing grounds for reading narratology into Byron’s poetry:

The milk drawn from the mountain goat  
Was changed for water from the moat,  
Our bread was such as captive’s tears  
Have moisten’d many thousand years,  
Since man first pent his fellow men  
Like brutes within an iron den;  
But what were these to us or him?  

(Byron, “The Prisoner of Chillon”. In: Pocock 1948: VII)

The reader will realize that the narrator recounts their experiences of misery, desperation, affliction, and the deplorable experience of scarcity of food in the beautiful image of ‘captive’s tears’ (VII). Further, he creates the image of themselves in prison in the likeness of animals or ‘brutes within an iron den’. This kind of description can only come from a character in the story, an eyewitness narrator who, at the moment of narration thinks in images. According to the narrator who appears to be familiar with the gruesome realities of incarceration, his brother’s decline (physical breakdown, perhaps), ‘was caused by none of these conditions but by confinement itself’ (Marshall 1962: 88): ‘But why delay the truth’, ‘he died, and they unlocked his chain’. In what follows is a description of the narrator’s personal reaction to the moment of his brother’s death, which again emphasizes a sense of physical presence on the scene of action: ‘I saw, and could not hold his head, / Nor reach his dying
hand-nor-dead, - / Though hard I strove, but strove in vain, / To rend and gnash my bonds in
twain. / He died - and they unlock’d his chain, / And scoop’d for him a shallow grave / I
begg’d them, as a boon, to lay / His corse in dust whereon the day / Might shine - it was a
foolish thought’ (VII). The formal aspects of the above lines which include ‘I’ and verbs of
action (‘I strove’, ‘I saw’ and ‘I begg’d’) have the important effect of placing the narrator in
action as one of the characters in the story, specifically the one who experienced or caused
events he/she is recounting. If constructing a first-person text is determined by the degree of
the narrator’s participation in the action, then the above verbs that suggest the narrator’s
participation in almost all events have the potential effect of constructing a narrative situation
in the first-person and, consequently, of demonstrating the role of the homodiegetic narrator
as an analytical device.

Recollections associated with the speaker’s younger brother (the favourite and the
flower most cherished in the family), memories of his emotions, tenderness, kindness and
compassion for mankind lead him to emphasize his emotions, the isolation and physical
reactions that are all pivotal factors in the interpretation of first-person homodiegetic
narration. Many action verbs which characterize section VIII as homodiegetic narration
occurs when the speaker describes his reactions at the time of his brother’s death: ‘I listen’d’,
The presence of these narrating phrases makes it possible for the reader to assume that the
narrator is a character in the story. The impression created is also the fact that the agent who
caused the events to happen is the same person recounting and interpreting the said events.
Prison experiences push the narrator to contemplate suicidal death, a death whose avoidance
he attributes to faith:

I know not why,
I could not die,
I had no earthly hope-but faith,
And that forbade a selfish death.

(Byron, “The Prisoner of Chillon”. In: Pocock 1948: VIII)

In telling his own story by means of ‘I’ linguistic device: ‘for I was sunk in silence - lost /
Alas! My own was full as Chill’ (VIII), the homodiegetic narrator records not only his
physical and mental actions, but his isolation and hopelessness, which approximates what
Marshall (1962) describes as ‘the crisis of sanity’. Again, indicators such as ‘I’ and action
verbs have significant consequences for the analysis of “The Prisoner of Chillon” as
homodiegetic in the sense that they signal a contrast between a first-person narrator and an
authorial narrator who is never in the action or fictional world with the characters. In contradistinction to authorial narrators who are often located outside the story, and whose narration is characterized by the dominance of the external perspective, the narrator of the poem under study appears to signal that he/she is in the fictional world causing the physical and mental actions on which the story is based.

Action-verbs which, in addition to signaling the dominance of the internal perspective, reveal the narrator’s physical and emotional involvement in his/her narrative, and consequently locate narration in the ‘internal processes, thoughts and feelings of the narrating and experiencing’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 112) are pivotal in an interpretation of the texts of the poem as a dramatic monologue. Consequently, they also reinforce my hypotheses that Byron’s poetry provides grounds to speak about homodiegetic narration and his contribution to the development of narrative techniques. The moment of hysterical paralysis (unconsciousness) or near madness during which the narrator loses, first, awareness of light, then a sense of space and of time (Marshall 1962: 91) is narrated in such a way that the illusion created is that of an explicit narrator telling his/her own story. The revelation that the narrator experienced temporal unconsciousness and lost a sense of inner and external reality makes it necessary to interpret certain areas of the narrative as characterized by cognitive and physical restrictions: ‘What next befell me then and there / I know not well - I never knew- / I had no thought, no feeling-none- / As shrubless crags/For all was blank, and bleak / But silence, and a stirless breath’/ ‘I had no thought, no feeling-none- / For all was blank / A sea of stagnant idleness, / Blind, boundless, mute, and motionless!’ (“The Prisoner of Chillon”, IX:356). The speaker’s present situation which approximates what Marshall (1962: 91) calls ‘hysterical paralysis’ would appear, at first sight irreconcilable with his narration as homodiegetic. Notice that the use of psychoanalogies comparing the speaker to objects and vegetation ‘I stood a stone, / as shrubless crags within the mist;’ emphasizes nothing but physical and spiritual paralysis, in another sense, lifelessness. The question here is, if the expression ‘What next befell me then and there / I know not well-I never knew -, / I had no thought, no feeling – none [but] stirless breath’ is intended to convey the impression of lack of self-awareness, or even of total unconsciousness, understood as the moment when one is spiritually, psychologically and emotionally dead, then one may likely ask the question of who is the agent that recorded the events? Even though there are no indications that the narrating self is able to reach his past thoughts by means of memory in the manner the reader would expect in first-person autobiographical retrospective narration, the frequent use of the ‘I’, the employment of action-verbs, and the reference to his/her ignorance are meant to
conjure up the illusion that ‘at the moment of experience the younger self cannot know itself; the older self, at the moment of narrating recalls these’ (Cohn 1978). This is neither to imply that the autobiographical retrospective narration employs memory to create the past through narration nor to claim that there exist explicit cognitive and deictic markers that underlie a temporal distance separating the narrating self from the experiencing self (Cohn 1978: 151). What the lines suggest, rather, is the fact that the text constructs dissonant self-narration (Cohn 1978: 155), to describe a distanced, wise, and discursive narrator turning back on a past self that was ignorant at the time of experience.

“Churchill’s Grave” is another narrative poem which contains indicators that the narrator is actively involved in his/her narration and may be particularly helpful to account for the functions of linguistic devices in constructing homodiegetic narration in Byron’s poetry. The poem is narrated in the first-person voice by an autodiegetic narrator who recounts the story of his experience when he visited the place where Churchill was buried. The profusion of first-person singular pronouns in the following fragment provides corroborative grounds for my argument:

I stood beside the grave of him who blazed  
The comet of a season, and I saw  
The humblest of all sepulchers, and gazed  
With not the less of sorrow and of awe,  
On that neglected turf and quiet stone,  
With name no clearer than the names unknown,  
Which lay unread around it; and I ask’d  
The Gardener of that ground, why it might be  
That for this plant strangers his memory task’d  
Through the thick deaths of half a century;  

(Byron, In: Pocock 1948: 180)

To answer the question of ‘who speaks’,216 as an attempt to construct the autodiegetic narrating voice of the poem and its functions, linguistic signals in the first person ‘I’, and the various action verbs such as ‘saw’ ‘gazed’ and ‘ask’d’ constitute useful indicators. As further signals that the autodiegetic narrator is placed on the scene of the events, the action verbs ‘stood, ‘saw’, and ‘ask’d’ serve to convey the impression of one telling the story of events he himself caused, hence a story of personal experience. Enhancing evidence that narration is autodiegetic and which corresponds with the internal position of the protagonist on the scene of the event is deduced from the use of the deictic- ‘I stood’. The deictics of place: ‘beside the

216 Genette (1980 [1972]) in narrative discourse proposes the question ‘who speaks’ to serve as a reliable criterion for identification of narrative voice. See also Chatman (1978).
grave’ and ‘around it’ permit a similar understanding that the autodiegetic narrator is the protagonist of the story he is recounting. The particular expressions: ‘I ask’d the Gardener of that ground’ / And this he answered ‘well I do not know / Why frequent travellers turn to Pilgrim’s so’ contain dialogue which is likely to create the impression of another story character to whom the narrator spoke, and provides further analytical clues by which an autodiegetic narrator’s textual manifestation can be gauged. The reader will also notice that, in contrast to the external authorial narrator who narrates in the third-person (both covert and overt), the attribution of action-verbs like ‘I stood’, ‘I saw’, and ‘I ask’d’ to the narrating voice also creates the impression of a diegetic character. Such clues bring out further narrating functions a homodiegetic narrator can carry out which an authorial one cannot such as communicating directly with another character inside the fictional world. The effect of such a narrative device is that the voice one hears is the direct voice of the author of both the text and the events he himself caused and witnessed. The linguistic devices in the first-person, the deictic of position and the conversational style of the poem can serve as important clues for the construction of homodiegetic narration. The same techniques could also function as differential categories that enable the reader to see the ways by which a first-person homodiegetic narrator communicates events, or differs from a third-person authorial voice.217

The fact that the first-person narrator of “The Prisoner of Chillon”, like first-person narrators in general, is restricted ‘by the barriers of human cognition and physical limitation’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 112) gives rise to a prominent factor that needs to be considered in the interpretation of the poem as homodiegetic. The narrator (prisoner) is in the action when a bird visits him and sings to comfort him in prison (X). Unlike the authorial narrator, he acknowledges his lack of knowledge regarding his guest’s motives for visiting and also for singing, and can only surmise by means of the verb ‘seemed’: ‘And song that said a thousand things, / And seem’d to say them all for me! / It seem’d like me to want a mate,’ / I know not if it late were free’ (X). Hence the picture that the speaker renders is that of a narrator who cannot provide legitimate explanation for events the he witnessed. And since the narrator uses ‘seemed’ to speculate the bird’s motive for visiting and hence avoid convincing the reader of the objectivity of his account, the speculative word ‘seemed’ can serve as an indicator for marking his narration as homodiegetic.

217 See Jahn (2005: 1, 8) for the use of this phrase in a different context.
The fact that the narrator’s manner of narrating continues to rest on personal and emotional experience - with no reference to external reality - is again relevant for marking narration in the first-person. This is noticed in a passage from “The Prisoner of Chillon” in which the narrator attempts to account for his regeneration. In the manner of Marshall’s reading (1962: 92), Elledge (1968: 51) notes that the regeneration process begins with the image of ‘light’ in the form of a bird’s ‘Carol’ which ‘broke’ in upon the ‘brain’ of the narrator: ‘A light broke in upon my brain, / It was the Carol of a bird; / The sweetest song ear ever heard, / but then by dull degrees came back / My senses to their wonted track’ (“The Prisoner of Chillon”: X). In the description of the psychological process of regaining consciousness from emotional and physical unawareness, it is still the narrating character’s actions and emotions that are central to narration. The speaker is the one who ‘hear[s] the carol of a bird; / The sweetest song,’ whose effect on him is revitalizing: ‘by dull degrees came / My senses to their wonted track’. The narrating character’s emotional reaction to this psychic experience is described: ‘And mine was thankful till my eyes / Ran over with the glad surprise’. The adjectives: ‘thankful’ and ‘glad surprise’ have many functions. They put the narrator in action as a character in the story. They also function to reveal the homodiegetic narrator’s happy mode, emotions or state of mind as he welcomes his unexpected guest - the ‘bird’. He speculates that the bird is in need of a companion: ‘It seem’d like me to want a mate,’ and consequently ‘come to love’ him. The bird’s appearance and sweet song is very significant for the speaker’s reawakening and possible transformation from emotional and physical paralysis and loneliness to awareness. Despair gives way to hope and wishful thinking: ‘And it was come to love me when / it were, in winged guise, / A visitant from paradise; / I sometimes deem’d that it might be / My brother’s soul come down to me’ (“The Prisoner of Chillon”: X).

The fusion of the image of light (in the form of a bird’s song) with the narrator’s brain: ‘A light broke in upon my brain, / It was the carol of a bird’ (X) is very appropriate to the narrator’s position inside the story as participant and experiencing character of the events he is recounting. The ‘complete collapse of sensory perception’, or ‘the natural confusion of the senses [is] suddenly reactivated’ (Elledge 1968: 51). Elledge’s point is that ‘the speaker’s physical and emotional responses to the presence of the bird’ are conveyed in the sentences describing the carol as the ‘sweetest song ear ever heard’. The further phrase: his eyes ‘ran over with glad surprise’ until the senses return to their ‘wonted track’ (51) is also relevant for the way the emotional event links the speaker to his narration. The bird’s visit is very crucial for any attempt to understand autodiegetic narration/dramatic monologue and its modes of
textual manifestations. To adopt Elledge’s analysis of the same fragment of the “Prisoner of Chillon” once again:

the Prisoner’s senses are revitalized. He sees once more not only the ‘dungeon walls and floor’, but also the ‘glimmer of the sun’ the ‘azure wings’ of the bird, and he hears the ‘song that said a thousand things’. At the same time the Bird revives ‘feeling’ however, it reawakens ‘thought’. And with thought comes the narrator’s conscious effort to identify himself with the bird, And thence the bird with the soul of his Brother-. (1968: 51-52)

The function of the bird goes beyond what Elle dge (1968: 51-52) sees as an attempt to ‘reawaken’ the narrator ‘to the continuity of life’. The bird interacts actively by singing a ‘carol’ that appears to rejuvenate the narrator’s spirit of apathy especially when he momentarily goes unconscious. By causing an event that contributes to narration, the bird contributes to fostering the plot of the story which is largely based on the narrating character’s introspections, emotional and physical actions and reactions. Through its activity of song, and its rejuvenating effect, the plot of the story is sustained, hence a functional effect.

An important indicator in the narrator’s account that marks first-person homodiegetically narrated poems off from what is to be expected in authorial narration is the apparent cognitive and physical limitations. Although numerous instances directing attention to the narrator trying to surmise what the motives of the bird are have been pointed out above, other examples occur in many sections of the poem. Again this is the subject of further stanzas of “The Prisoner of Chillon” implicit in the narrator’s acknowledgement of lack of knowledge or insight into the minds of other inmates (‘keepers’): ‘A kind of change came in my fate, / My keepers grew compassionate; / I know not what had made them so’ (XI). Similarly, the diegetic narrator cannot understand the state of mind and emotions of the fish he is watching ‘skimming down’ in the ‘blue Rhone’ when he makes a ‘footing in the wall’. He can only resort to speculation to suggest the state of mind of fish: ‘The fish swarm by the castle wall, / ‘they seem’d joyous each and all; / The eagle rode the rising blast, / Methought he never flew so fast / As then to me he seem’d to fly’ (XIII). The use of ‘seem’d’ occurs three times in this stanza and fits our understanding of a homodiegetic narrator as one who lacks knowledge of other minds. Unlike the authorial narrator who is endowed with unrestricted omniscience, the homodiegetic narrator cannot be in the world of the story and in the minds of characters and fishes at the same time. This also presupposes that any narration that contains signals for physical and cognitive restrictions will be important for the interpretation of first-person narrated poems.
Lack of omniscience is another factor that characterizes the narrator of “The Giaour”, and hence renders the poem as homodiegetic narrative. Since the narrating self was not present in the action on the day Leila fled from her husband’s (Hassan) home to elope with Giaour, he names the source of his information:

Strange remours in our city say
Upon the eve she fled away
When Rhamazan’s last sun was set,
[…]
Millions of lamps proclaim’d the feast
Of Bairam through the boundless East
’Twas then she went as to the bath,
Which Hassan vainly search’d in wrath;
For she was flown her master’s rage
[…]
And far beyond the Moslem’s power
Had wronged him with the faithless Giaour.
Somewhat of this had Hassan deem’d;
But still so fond, so fair she seem’d,
Too well he trusted to the slave
Whose treachery deserved a grave:
And on that eve had gone to the mosque,
And thence to feast in his kiosk.
Such is the tale his Nubians tell,

(Byron, “The Giaour”. In: Pocock 1948: 162)

The narrator seems to acknowledge his restricted authority as one narrating from inside the story when he/shemakes the point clear that the events he/she is recounting (that led to the disappearance of Leila) were not witnessed by him in person. He thus names the source of his information: ‘strange rumour’/ ‘Such is the tale the Nubians tell’. The impression also points towards the narrator’s physical limitations especially in those pages which create the illusion that he was not present at the scene of the events (the disappearance of Leila) he is recounting. This also ties in with narratological convention that the homodiegetic narrator who tells about other characters as witnesses has no insight into their consciousness, but can only surmise what the thoughts and feeling of others may be (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 112). One striking thing about the passage is the level of knowledge and cognitive authority possessed by the narrator. The type of narration constructed in the stanza gives the impression of ability to see into other minds: ‘But once I saw that face, yet then/It was so marked with inward pain’. The very expression ‘inward pain’ refers to Giaour’s psychological torment,

See Nünning/Nünning’s (2004: 112) illuminating discussion on the limitations of the first-person narrator. Their emphasis that although first-person narrators are not restricted to recounting only those events that they have witnessed personally, they are usually required to provide a legitimizing explanation for accounts of fictional events that they did not personally witnessed means that the source of information must be named, and reinforces the emphasis in the above lines.
which is a state of mind. In such a reading, what is discerned is the narrator’s unreliability since he cannot be trusted all the times. As an important dimension in homodiegetic narration, it is the speaker’s involvement in the action that gives added dimension to his narration as autodiegetic. At the present moment of narration signaled by the deictic ‘now’, Giaour’s state of mind is still one of psychological anguish (‘It breathes the same dark spirit now’). The most important function of the phrases ‘It breathes the same dark spirit’ is that it suggests knowledge of other minds especially in homodiegetic narration and fits our understanding of unreliable narration. It also exists as apparent contradiction to the convention of homodiegetic narration. One begins to wonder if a homodiegetic narrator is also accredited with the powers of omniscience attributed to authorial narrators. Such a contradiction however introduces another narrative device parallipsis\(^{219}\) understood to mean claiming more knowledge, competence or authority of powers than legitimated by narratological convention. The technique of parallipsis in the above text creates the impression of a homodiegetic narrator claiming uncircumscribed cognitive and spatial limits.

One further pivotal parameter for analysing homodiegetic narration and which can be helpful in meaning construction is the self-quoted monologue, understood by Cohn (1978: 162) to designate an instance when the narrator quotes his past thoughts to separate them from his present thoughts. We may need to resort to “The Prisoner of Chillon” for illustration. In the narrator’s description of his predicament (which is caused by the fact that he has ‘buried one and all / No child - no sire - no kin had I / No partner in my misery; / And the whole earth will henceforth be / A wider prison unto me’), he quotes his thoughts at the time: ‘I thought of this, and I was glad’ (XII). Self-quotation is marked by ‘I thought’ and is linked to credibility, which is important for analyzing narration in the first-person as homodiegetic. The result of living a life devoid of essence is to love despair, at least on the part of the protagonist. Since the prisoner appears to lack omniscience, he can only attempt to retrieve his past thoughts by the thought technique of self-quotation.

Fleischman’s (1990: 32) suggestion that tense can be “linked to a speaking subject” and can become invaluable for determining the identity of a homodiegetic narrator can be sustained in the analysis of “The Prisoner of Chillon” and other poems by means of the devices of simultaneous and retrospective narrations. An analysis of “The Prisoner of Chillon”, from first to the last stanza, features retrospective narrative as a prominent device.

that is suited to link experience/action to the narrating character of the events recounted. The important device of retrospective narration can be accounted for by an analysis of stanzas in which the speaker, who is also the autodiegetic narrator of the story, narrates a sad and painful story of his own experience in prison where he lived a life of loneliness, isolation, deprivation, physical and psychological torture. The first stanza of the poem provides an illustrative example of retrospective narration and it is here that the functions of narration in marking the speaker’s identify can again be constructed:

I suffer’d chains and courted death;
That father perish’d at the stake
For tenets he would not forsake;
And for the same his lineal race
In darkness found a dwelling place;
We were seven who now are one,
Six in youth and one in age,
Finish’d as they had begun,
Proud of persecution’s rage;
One in fire and two in field,
Their belief with blood have seal’d;
Dying as their father died,
For the God their foes denied; -
Three were in a dungeon cast,
Of whom this wreck is left the last.

(Byron, “The Prisoner of Chillon” I. In: Pocock 1948: 351)

In the above stanza, and elsewhere in the poem, the reader is invited to note that the autodiegetic narrator tells the story of his own experiences, and he does so retrospectively by means of the device of the past tense. A profusion of sentences recounting the speaker’s experiences and perceptions in the past tense exist as corroborative evidence: ‘I suffer’d chains, courted death’ (I); ‘they chained us each to a column stone, / And we were three -’, ‘Twas but some solace, in the dearth / of the pure elements of earth, / our voices took’ (III). The use of past tense is signaled by ‘suffer’d’, ‘chained’, ‘were’, ‘Twas’, and ‘took’. These devices contribute to strengthen my suggestion that the painful tale of imprisonment is a past experience remembered and recounted by the speaker who is at the same time the narrating character of the events. Another example of retrospective past tense autodiegetic narration is a passage about the perceptual activities of the experiencing character of the events. What is retrieved from memory in stanza X of the poem is the teller’s regeneration which precedes his momentary period of physical and emotional stagnation. This particular example has further implications for an understanding of the role retrospective narration play in the

---

220 See also Huhn (2005: 155) for the use of the phrase in a similar context of narration.
221 The stanza describes this period as ‘A sea of stagnant idleness, / Blind, bound-less, mute, and motionless!’
analysis of poetry. Retrospective narration is again determined by past tense references such as ‘broke’, ‘was’, ceased, ‘heard’, ‘came’ etc. Secondly, the ‘mind’, where the setting has temporarily shifted, is temporarily reactivated from its former situation of ‘fixedness’ and ‘stirless breath’ (IX) Furthermore, the bird’s song (which is responsible for this regeneration, and which is the ‘sweetest song ear ever heard’, and which also ‘seem’d’ to say ‘a thousand things’ all for the speaker can be read as a narration of past experience. Further, a mental adjective like ‘glad surprise’ which suggests the narrator’s emotional response to the sweetest song’ of the bird becomes particularly important in that it can establish a direct link between the past perceptual activities of the story teller and his autodiegetic position in the story. As a functional effect, retrospective narration in the above fragments reveals the potential of the past tense device for constructing a homodiegetic narrative situation.

The question of what markers signalize retrospective narration and allow grounds for staging its functions in Byron’s poetry can thus be answered by citing such references as ‘deem’d’, ‘came’, and ‘flew’ as used in the above passage describing the narrator’s projection of his feelings and situation of loneliness (‘a lonely cloud’) after the bird’s departure. The further function of retrospective narration is that the device helps for an understanding of textual manifestations of auto-or homodiegetic narration. In addition, the recapitulation of prison experiences both in the past tense forms, in perceptual devices of hearing and seeing and also in imagistic patterns recounting isolation constitutes a form of self-identification, but also anchor’s peculiarities in Byron’s narrative style.

Narration in the present tense is introduced in “The prisoner of Chillon” when the narrator switches to the present moment of narration to speak about the chains and blindness: ‘That iron is a cankering thing, / For in these limbs its teeth remain, / With mark’s that will not wear away, / Till I have done with this new day,/ Which now is painful to these eyes’ (II). The present tense device is marked by ‘is’. In addition, deictics such as ‘these’, ‘this’ and ‘now’ have an important function in analyzing narration as homodiegetic since they not only place the narrator in the story as a character but effectively create the impression that the voice one hears is that of the older and narrating protagonist. Narration in the present tense also gives the impression of simultaneous telling since the ‘is’ and deictics cited above create the illusion of a narrator telling the story as it unfolds. As references to the present moment of narration are only occasional, the narrative strategy the narrator henceforth deploys is the autodiegetic retrospect past, and by means of the device, what is continually emphasized is the subjectivity and point of view of the experiencing and narrating character of the events.
Reading “The Prisoner of Chillon” as homodiegetic narration with the speaker as protagonist therefore implies the presence of textual strategies ranging from personalized references to context clues, deictics, physical and knowledge barriers, mode of narration and other markers that approximates such a description. Notice that in narrating the story of imprisonment, emphasis is on the story world, on the speaker’s personal experiences such as imprisonment, physical actions, emotions and thoughts. Since the speaker himself causes the events that are being narrated, clues identified above can mark the narrator as a character inside the story and this can induce an interpretation of the poem as homodiegetic. Relying also on the repeated use of ‘I’ throughout the poem as well as on evidence of the speaker’s involvement in all action-oriented sentences, the story is indubitably constructed on the conventions of homodiegetic narration, rendering obvious the functional effects of the devices analyzed above.

One cannot discuss the productiveness of the device of tense styles in marking narration as homodiegetic without considering “The Prophecy of Dante”. “The Prophecy of Dante” is a first-person narrated poem that uses the technique of prospective narration to allow for a construction of certain functions. Unlike “The Prisoner of Chillon”, “Mazeppa”, and ‘The Lament of Tasso”, the narrator does not base his narration on external actions he caused. The dominant event is a psychic one, a prophetic vision he acquires, as the title indicates. It is a first-person prospective narration in which, (in contrast to narratological convention), the first-person narrator attempts to prophecy, often reflecting on human experience in general. The poem has four major divisions, called cantos, each of which focuses on the homodiegetic narrator’s reflections and prophecies.

In the first Canto, the speaker names himself ‘I’, as he bemoans his deprivation from the ‘immortal vision which could heal’ his ‘earthly sorrows’ (I). He remembers his dead wife-Beatrice who meant everything for him: ‘thou wert my life, the essence of my thought’ (I), and was so attractive to his eyes which ‘now’ have become ‘dim’ and ‘old’, with world’s war, and years, and banishment’ (I). The ‘now’ signifies that the voice one hears is that of the ‘mature’ self of the protagonist (Marshall 1962: 127).

The injustices the narrator had suffered keep haunting him, and for the love of Beatrice he keeps addressing her as if she were present. He had resolved not to take vengeance. Constructing his story on future events, he contemplates revenge: ‘When we shall mount again, and they that trod / be trampled on,’ (I). Prospective narration is embodied in the
word ‘shall’. The shift from past to the future tense does not however alter the narrating voice. In the manner of an apostrophe, he recollects and addresses Florence again:

Thee, whom I late saw in thy loftiest reign,
Even in that glorious vision, which to see
And live, was never granted until now,
And yet thou hast permitted this to me

(Byron, “The Prophecy of Dante” I. In: Pocock 1948)

It would appear the speaker perceives Florence rather in his imagination (‘vision’), the vision has ‘now’ become for him a reality. This vision is so strong that it awakens in the speaker’s mind feelings of strange conjectures, fantasies, and introspections:

Alas! With what weight upon my brow
The sense of earth and earthly things comes back,
Corrosive passions, feelings dull and low,
The heart’s quick throb upon the mental rack,
Long day, dreary night; the retrospect
Of half a century bloody and black,

(Byron, “The Prophecy of Dante” I. In: Pocock 1948)

He ends the stanza by recollecting his rejection: ‘they made an exile- […] a slave of me’ (I).

The notion of prophecy and romantic imagination that is likened to prospective narration in the poem is again sustained in the subsequent stanza. The elements of imagination or high powers that reside only in the narrator’s mind are embodied in the word ‘the melancholy gift of higher powers’. The homodiegetic narrator’s ‘prophetic eye’ (III) turns out to share significant correlations with omniscience attributed to third-person authorial narration, enabling the narrator to see into the future and to prophesy the fate of Florence:

‘And melancholy gift of high powers allow / To read the future; / I but foretell thy foretunes / My heart shall be pour’d over thee and break: / Thy soil shall still be pregnant with the wise, / Some voices shall be heard, and earth shall listen; There shall be some who will not sing in vain, / And love shall be his torment; but his grief / Shall make an immortality of tears’ “The Prophecy of Dante” (III). The future tense is signaled by ‘shall’ which is unusual in homodiegetic narration. In this moment of visionary awareness, the narrator’s imagination becomes more active to the point that he foresees and interprets future events in the manner of one with an insight into other minds, or, into future events. The reader learns that the ‘soil shall still be pregnant with the wise’ which shall constitute the gay, the learned, the generous, and the brave. Besides the fact that Florence shall be blessed with ‘an illustrious’ generation, something significant too shall happen. Some ‘being’ ‘shall be’ sent. The profusion of ‘shall’ is already a signal that narration is prospective, and ties in with the title of the poem “The
Prophecy of Dante”. Perhaps one may say that the act of prophesying and seeing into future events is the work of the imagination since there is no reference to external action. Imagination is also linked to the activities of the mind and has the potential to carry the narrator forward into the future, and enables him/her, in the manner of omniscience, to foresee and foretell future events—a privilege denied homodiegetic narrators. However, this vision takes on a special significance because the homodiegetic narrator does not see into other minds but into the future.

The question one may ask is that of the voice arrogating prophetic and omniscient potentials: ‘some voices shall be heard, and earth shall listen’, and further that, ‘poets shall follow in the path / And make it broader’, / ‘The birds shall sing and raise their notes as natural and high; / Tuneful shall be their numbers; they shall sing’ (“The Prophecy of Dante”: III). The reader may be tempted to attribute the voice to an external narrating agent or authorial narrator. Ironically, it is the voice of the homodiegetic narrator, who apparently arrogates omniscience reserved only for third-person authorial narrators. The reader again notices the use of parallipsis and omniscience as techniques in the construction of meaning in poetry - techniques some would regard as transgressive in a first-person context. Nonetheless, the techniques may account for some of the ways Byron experimented with narration.

More examples abound as evidence of the uses of retrospective device in constructing homodiegetic narration. The passage below is narrated from the awareness of the narrating self who ‘now’ recollects the cheerful days he used to roam the mountains as he compares the past with the present sad moment which is just as unstable as his wandering or unstable thoughts:

But those hardy days flew cheerily,
And when they now fall drearily,
My thoughts, like swallows skim the main,
And bear my spirit back again
Over the earth, and through the air,
A wild bird and a wanderer.

(Byron, “The Siege of Corinth”. In: Pocock 1948: 304)

The passage is marked by what Cohn (1978: 145; 151) calls ‘self analytic mental retrospective narration’, revealing a narrator who dissociates himself from his past self by means of the deictic ‘now’. The past life of the experiencing self which was certainly a happy one is suggested by the word ‘cheerily’ and contrasted with the present moment in which life has become uncomfortable for the narrator implied by the word ‘drearily’. The switch from the past of the experiencing self (which is conveyed in the past tense references such as
The present moment of the narrating self is suggested by the deictic ‘now’. The narrating self has come to realize that life is no longer as cheerful and pleasant as it used to be. The present uncomfortable situation is also conveyed in the image associating the narrator’s wandering and unstable ‘thoughts’ with a ‘wild bird’, rendering his recollections afresh. The narrator’s thoughts appear to have achieved a rejuvenating impact: ‘Tis this that ever wakes my strain’ (‘The Siege of Corinth’, 305). The impression conveyed by this expression is that the narrating self’s imagination reawakens him/her from imaginative sterility and unproductive life to creative exuberance or inspiration. Although the narrating self appears to be wiser than the experiencing self, he can only rely on his thoughts or memory to retrieve the past, reawaken his spirits and thus regains his creative inspiration. What one draws from the above analysis is that both the narrating and the experiencing self are placed in action sentences, and thus create the impression of a homodiegetic narrative situation. The use of tense styles identified and analyzed above have the productive effects that they can allow for various new ways of constructing meaning in narrative poems written in the first-person than earlier attempts have done.

A transgeneric narratological technique that is significant for an interpretation of homodiegetic narration in Byron’s poetry is the dramatic monologue. Like its counterpart “The Prisoner of Chillon”, “The Lament of Tasso” provides features of a dramatic monologue that bring the poem closer to a homodiegetically narrated story. A starting point for my interpretation of the poem as a monologue is the earlier readings of Marshall (1962) and Kirchner (1973: 63) which have the impact of letting the reader see the restrictions in previous interpretations of the poem. Relying on the various forms adopted by the persona to justify the poem’s status as monologue, Kirchner (1973: 63) sums up her analysis in the following terms: ‘Tasso’s situation has been seen as a struggle between two selves’, or rather, two images of the self, one of a being indomitable and the other of ‘a broken reed’ with its ‘last bruise’. The statement regarding the two selves, which appears to be the grounds on which Kirchner finds traces of dramatic monologue in the poem, originates from Marshall (1962: 113). The reader however notices that the question of how the monologue renders the poem as homodiegetic and provides a narrative effect which such readings are suited to provoke remains unjustified by genuine narratological evidence. In other words, the question of what markers signalize a monologue and links it to homodiegetic narration needs attention here. In other to answer this question, the reader is invited to take a look at the following illustrative example in which
besides personalized reference and active plot engagement, phrases that suggest introspection play a crucial role in staging narration in the first person as a monologue:

Long years! - It tries the thrilling frame to bear
And eagle-spirit of a child of Song
Long years of outrage, calumny, and wrong;
Imputed madness, prison’d solitude,
And the mind’s canker in its savage mood,
When the impatient thirst of light and air
Parches the heart; and the abhorred grate,
Marring the sunbeams with its hideous shade,
Works through the throbbing eyeball to the brain
With a hot sense of heaviness and pain;
And bare, at once, Captivity display’d
Stands scoffing through the never-open’d gate,
Which nothing through its bars admits, save day,
And tasteless food, which I have eat alone
Till its unsocial bitterness is gone;
And I can banquet like a beast of prey,
Sullen and lonely, couching in the cave
Which is my lair, and–it may be–my grave.
All this hath somewhat worn me, and may wear,
But must be borne. I stoop not to despair;
For I have battled with mine agony

(Byron, “The Lament of Tasso” I. In: Pocock 1948: 362)

The question here is that of how one can account, in transgeneric narratological terms for the fact that the fragment quoted above (as well as the rest of the poem) is a monologue narrated by a homodiegetic narrator? The question can be answered in many ways based on the textual clues on which narration is constructed. First, the narrator deploys the narrative device of ‘I’ since he/she names him/herself as ‘I’. Second, there are no indications of physical action since narration is based on the thoughts and introspections of the prisoner who is locked up in a lonely cell. The narrator lets the reader see his inner experiences which comprise feelings of ‘solitude’, trauma (an affliction caused by ‘canker of the mind’), ‘loneliness’, mental torture and pain caused by ‘sunbeams’ whose ‘hideous shade work through the throbbing eyebrow to the brain’. All these including his/her reflections constitute the story he is telling. Reflecting and broading on the debasement, torture and caprices meted on him in prison, the narrator expresses his feelings and introspections by means of verbs and adjectives that may suggest that it is the mind that is at work in the narrative process:

I was indeed delirious in my heart,
To lift my love so lofty as thou art;
But still my frenzy was not of the mind;
I knew my fault, and feel my punishment
Not less because I suffer it unbent.

(Byron, “The Lament of Tasso” II. In: Pocock 1948: 363)
Adjectives such as ‘delirious’ and ‘frenzy’ convey violent emotional states of excitement often associated with events that are mental and not physical. Similarly, in verbs such as ‘knew’, ‘feel’, and ‘suffer’, what appears to be emphasized are introspections, feelings and a state of mental unrest of the narrating ‘I’. The verbs and adjectives analyzed locate the action internally in the mind of the prisoner and fit our understanding of a monologue.

A further passage from “The Lament of Tasso” (III) that creates grounds to see narration centered on the prisoner’s inward life and introspections and thus conveys the impression of a monologue is a description of contemplation of revenge against what he/she considers to be injustice. Notice that the narrator comes out obtrusively to identify him/herself as ‘I’, hence all verbs and adjectives that suggest mental activities are associated with the homodiegetic narrator. If contemplation and introspection are mental states linked to monologue, there is no doubt that the passage contains further traces in the verb ‘feel’ and thoughts of revenge. Moreover, the narrator is placed in the setting which he himself describes both from past and present experience in words that suggest solitude and loneliness: ‘sullen and lonely, couching in the cave / Which is my lair, - and it may be – my grave’ (“The Lament of Tasso”, I). The horrible conditions and the cries of other voices he/she hears in agony have had a physical and psychological impact on the narrator: ‘all this hath some what worn me, and may wear’ (“The Lament of Tasso”, II). By creating grounds to see the narrator’s introspections and not physical actions, and by making the narrator the teller of his/her own emotional experiences, the ‘I’ is individualized and the monologue projected. The explanation above creates grounds to see the device of monologue as a marker of homodiegetic narration.

In the further stanzas narration in “The Lament of Tasso” (VI) recedes into reflections especially when the narrator muses on his past love for Eleonorra. Narration in that passage reveals not the narrator’s physical actions. What is emphasized and what orients the narration are the speaker’s passions, desires, and emotional and psychic activities: ‘My soul was drunk with love’,/ And the whole heart exhaled into One Want’). After recalling one passionate moment with Eleonorra (Marshall 1962: 116), the narrator discloses that it is for this love that he is imprisoned: ‘Fit for this cell, which wrongs me, but for thee /Thy very love which lock’d me to my chain’ (V). The narrator links his love experience to nature (V), which, to him, ‘created from the flowers and rocks a paradise of love’ (Marshall 1962: 117). Not withstanding the persecution he endured as a result of this love, and given that he ‘wept alone’, he is happy because he found Eleonorra. Another evidence that narration in the poem
centers on emotional experience is when the narrator admits his madness: ‘I feel at times my mind decline, / But with a sense of decay’ (VIII). He appeals to the silent Eleonorra for courage: ‘though heavy, lend me vigour to sustain, ‘foil the ingenuity of pain’ (V). In other moments, the narrator appears to experience hallucinations: ‘I see / unwonted lights along my prison shine, / And a strange demon, who is vexing me, / With pilfering pranks and petty pains’ (VIII). In contrast to “The Prisoner of Chillon”, another monologue with little action, the main action in “The Lament of Tasso” is predominantly a psychic one, constituted of introspecting, seeing, reflecting and feeling: ‘I was quick in feeling’ (IX). What is to be learned from the above analysis, or what connects it to homodiegetic narration? Besides the obvious reasons of the narrator’s active participation in the plot suggested by many references to him/herself as ‘I’, focus, for the most part is on the narrator’s reflections or mental torture. The strategies analyzed above tend to create the impression that the narrator is one of the characters in the story. The reader does not find traces of the physical activities of the narrator and Eleonorra. The reflections are largely what create the dramatic monologue effects. In other words, it is not physical actions that construct the narration. The constant references to the narrator’s reflections are indications that the poem is a dramatic monologue. The evidence can also mark narration in the first-person as homodiegetic.

As there exist many forms by which first-person narrators enter the narrative texts and perform narrative functions, it should also be pointed out that first-person narrators do not only recount events fully witnessed; but can also recount those witnessed by other characters in the story using such important devices as metanarrative comments and mixed-mode narration. A starting point for an analysis of a text as metanarrative construction of homodiegetic narration would be “The Giaour” because in its construction of intradiegetic levels within the narrator discourse, the poem features an illustrative use of the device metannative in Byron’s poetry. Kirchner (1973: 19-20) finds in this tale: ‘A surprising complexity of personae interaction [...]’, summing up her conclusions that ‘it is an awkward’ and ‘fragmentary poem, not nearly so structured’. When M. K. Joseph (1966: 50-51) observes, with regard to the poem’s manner of narration, that ‘a single viewpoint is lost’, with the effects that ‘the process of expansion begins at once, [...] it is sudden in its transitions’, there is no doubt that he is raising the issue of many narrating voices clearly discernible in Kirchner’s reading of the poem. There is no doubt that, in the light of their conclusions, the reader finds an authorial narrator at the extradiegetic level who introduces the tale proper, a fisherman (the homodiegetic narrator or narrating character), Hassan, a monk, and the Giaour himself, all occupying different levels as well as introduces frame tales within the narrative.
The first part of the poem casts narration in an authorial (heterodiegetic) voice. This first level reports from a position external to action. narration centers on the story character-Giaour who will also become another narrator (intradiegetic) toward the end of the poem. Although Joseph’s and Kirchner’s readings do not conceptualize voice in reference terms, and consequently lack the effects of letting the reader see how the voices contribute to an understanding of intradiegetic forms of narration as homodiegetic, the analysis of these speaking agents may provide ample opportunity to see the technique of metanarrative in practice and function.

The opening lines of the narrative- “The Giaour” (151) in a typical covert voice creates the illusion of heterodiegetic narration. The narrator is unobtrusive and begins his narration in a third-person authorial manner. In the first part describing a tomb, narration contains no individuating traits; rather, it is the voice of an authorial agent at a heterodiegetic level that opens in a note of regret with a description of the grave of a great hero. The use of direct address (‘fair clime!’) in a passage that evokes the glories of Greece in metaphors of ‘Oceans’ cheek, / ‘Edens’ (151) is important in identifying the level as heterodiegetic. The beautiful description of the old shore of Greece with its nature beauties, and the sense of regret for lost Greece caused by man’s tyranny, wickedness and war reinforce the claim that the tone is that of an authorial narrator at an external level. The phrase ‘we start’ should not mislead the reader into thinking that the narrator is in the story’s action. We do not find him at all in action-oriented sentences in which intradiegetic characters like the fisherman, Hassan, the monk, and Giaour are located. He remains heterodiegetic, and what one hears is his voice. The addressee technique which is an element of metanarration is once resulted to when the heterodiegetic speaker turns to address, in a rhetorical question the offspring of the ‘unforgotten brave’ in a note of regret and painful remembrance to demand their excuse. The position of this voice is extradiegetic, and hence, he constantly speaks directly to his addressee with whom he is placed on the same level.

A further step in the investigation of metanarrative commentary takes us into the introduction of an intradiegetic level with an intradiegetic narrator. It is through this level that Byron’s use of the homodiegetic narrator is made apparent. Numerous signals of intradiegetic and homodiegetic narration are evident at this level in the poem where a character steps in and begins to tell another story. The subordinate narrating agent is the fisherman who sees and interprets events. At the first level of “The Giaour”, the narrator names him/herself in the first person as ‘I’, thereby individualizing his narration: ‘I know thee not, I loathe thy race, / Right
well I view and deem thee one / Whom Othman’s son should slay or shun’ (“The Giaour”: 155). In the description of the burden or Leila’s corpse that is deposited in the river, the voice one hears is that of the homodiegetic narrator, and the impression created is that of an agent in narrative sentences: ‘I hear the sound of coming feet, / more near’ (159), ‘I watch’d it as it sank, / I gazed till vanishing from view’ (160). In addition to the fact that the narrator names him/herself as ‘I’, the use of narrating verbs such as ‘hear’ and ‘gazed’ create the impression of a narrating agent as participant or character, actor, and interpreter of events. Notice that the tense the narrator uses is the present tense suggesting that action is simultaneous with telling. In the manner of eyewitness description, it is still the intradiegetic (homodiegetic) narrator who takes us from the beach where Giaour appears on his black horse, to the sea where the body of the infidel Leila, is wrapped and disposed off:

Sullen it plunged, and slowly sank,
The calm wave rippled to the bank;
I watch’d it as it sank, methought
Some motion from the current caught
Bestirr’d it more, - ’twas but the beam
That checker’d o’er the living stream:
I gazed, till vanishing from view
Like lessening pebble it withdrew;
Still less and less, a speck of white
That gemm’d the tide, then mock’d the sight;

(Byron, “The Giaour”. In: Pocock 1948: 160)

The fact that the narrator makes his experience central in such phrases as ‘it plunged’, ‘I watched it’, and in the description of the sack he is watching as ‘gemm’ offers corroborative instances that narration is controlled from an internal voice and perspective. In the manner of eyewitness narration, the homodiegetic narrator on the second level uses a beautiful smile comparing a ‘mind’ brooding on ‘guilty woes’ or crimes, to ‘the scorpion girt by fire’:

The Mind that broods o’er guilty woes,
Is like the scorpion girt by fire,
In circle narrowing as it glows,
The flames around their captive close,
Till inly search’d by thousand throes,
And maddening in her ire,
One sad and sole relief she knows,
The sting she nourish’d for her foes [...].

(Byron, “The Giaour”. In: Pocock 1948: 161)

This text contains psychoanalysis and constitutes a typical example of metanarrative digressive commentary. The image of a scorpion ‘girt’ by fire is used to describe the extent to which Hassan’s mind is tormented by remorse eventhough in the course of the narration, it is the ‘guilt and remorse of the Giaour that is elaborated’, (when we are told that, tormented by
solitude and ‘leafless desert of the mind’, Giaour repents the death of Leila, but not of Hassan (M. K. Joseph 1966: 56). The psychoanalogy is what brings metarration into the text. Many critics would consider the device of metadigressive commentary in a first-person context as deviant narration, but it is important in characterizing Hassan and in marking the point of view as internal to the story.

The homodiegetic narrator follows Hassan and his ‘twenty vassals’ to the battle field interpreting the events to the reader using the past tense device: ‘They reach the grove of pine at last: ‘A bullet whistled o’er his head; / The foremost tarter bites the ground! / Scare had they time to check to the rein, / Swift from their steeds the rider’s bound; /The dying ask revenge in vain. /Some fly behind the nearest rock / And there await the coming shock’ (“The Giaour”, In: Pocock, 1948: 165). After describing the enemies who hide and ambush unseen, and the death of three soldiers, the narrator, who is observing the battle describes the scene of battle where some soldiers are ‘flying’ towards the ‘nearest rock’ for shelter. It is through this narrating agent that the reader is told that Hassan is daring, and determined to go on fighting. The narrator appears to be present on the scene of the fight as spectator. In his eye witness account of the battle, we hear: ‘fiery flashes in the van/ could now avail the promised prey; / then curled his very beard with ire, / and glared his eye with fiercer fire’ (“The Giaour”, In: Pocock, 1948: 166). The battle is a fierce one and the fight is intense, and one camp is about to give up. Far and near the bullets are heard: ‘A bullet whistled o’er his head; / The lately ambush’d foes appear, / The death shot hissing from afar; And now the foe their covert quit, / And call his vassals to submit’ (“The Giaour”, In Pocock, 1948: 165; 166; 167). The ‘now’ is the present moment of the story; hence there is consonance between action and narration. In other words, the experiencing character “I” is the same voice recounting the events. It is still the homodiegetic narrator who describes the death of Hassan in the manner of an eye witness account:

With sabre shiver’d to the hilt,
Yet dripping with blood he spilt;
Yet strain’d within the sever’d hand
Which quivers round that faithless brand;
His turban far behind him roll’d,
[…]
His breast with wounds unnumber’d riven,
His back to earth, his face to heaven,
Fall’d Hassan lies- his unclosed eye
Yet lowering on his enemy,
As if the hour that sealed his fate
Surving left his quenchless hate;
And o’er him bends that foe with brow
As dark as his that bled below-
The description gives the impression of one who is present on the scene of battle, and this is reinforced by the use of present tense. It is conventional that when the homodiegetic narrator attempts to read into Hassan’s mind to suggest his hatred for his enemies as in the above lines, he uses the conjecture ‘as if’ to imply his restricted cognition. But it is also important to note that such descriptions are suited to characterize first the narrator as homodiegetic, and second a character like Hassan to whose passions or attitude the word ‘hate’ conveys.

No where is M. K. Joseph’s assessment of the “The Giaour” that a single point of view is lost evident than in the further passages of the narration. Beginning from page 170 of “The Giaour”, the narrator is still homodiegetic, but the voice one hears is no longer that of the fisherman- the first homodiegetic narrator. He has stepped out completely after the description of the battle giving voice to other homodiegetic narrators- the monk and Giaour in succession. The scene in which the Monk recounts events when Giaour retires to the monastery to repent the death of his lover, - Leila; introduces another intradiegetic narrator telling a story within a story. One very obvious sign that narration is homodiegetic is the presence of the linguistic ‘I’ by which the Monk- the narrating character identifies himself. The narrating ‘I’ ‘saw’ Giaour personally some years back along the lonely shore. The past tense references in action or perceptual verbs like ‘saw’, ‘mark’d’, and ‘stamp’d’ (“The Giaour”, 171) implies that the narrator has taken the reader to the past to recount a particular instant he meets Giaour personally. Besides, such action verbs also function as reporting phrases directing attention to the third narrator-the Monk as an eye witness to the event he is recounting.

The last section of the poem is narrated by another intradiegetic narrator - Giaour whom we encounter at the beginning of the narrative at the seashore, and later in the battlefield. In the passages where he recounts his personal experiences and deeds in the manner of confession, he identifies himself in the first person linguistic reference ‘I’: I’ve ’scaped the worriness of life: / I loathed the languor of repose / Yet, lurks a wish within my breast / My memory now is but the tomb’ (175-176). The many references to the narrator in the first-person ‘I’ ties in with conventional assumptions that a character-narrator is identified in such linguistic markers. The linguistic marker ‘I’ is necessary for the construction of the intradiegetic voice that has taken over narration.

A further element in the narrative staging of the intradiegetic narrator of the poem, in addition to the linguistic markers in the first person, is the use of action-oriented verbs that create the illusion that the homodiegetic narrator was present on the scene of events he
recounts. The whole passage in which the narrator recounts his love for Leila and his killing of Hassan to avenge her death (in a confessional setting) is characterized by clues that suggest his/her involvement in the action: ‘[...] in the battle field it had been sweet; / I’ve braved it-not for honours boast; / ‘I loved’ her, Friar! nay, adored - / I proved it more in deeds than in words / A stain its steel can never lose: / Twas shed for her, who died for me, / She died / Not mine act, though I the cause. / Yet did he but what I have done / I laid him low’ (“The Giaour”: In Pocock, 1948: 177). In Giaour’s account above, action verbs like ‘braved’, ‘shed’, ‘cause’, ‘done’, and ‘laid’ are all part of his actions and activities that make up the plot of the story. In making himself central to the plot, the mystery about Leila’s death is further revealed. We are told that she was unfaithful to her husband by loving Hassan who seduced her. Giaour the narrator equally reveals that he killed Hassan to avenge the death of Leila, which was masterminded (caused) by Hassan. The intradiegetic narrator becomes an important agent in the narrative in the sense of furthering the plot of the story of marriage, infidelity and death.

In addition to the above, more evidence of the presence of the intradiegetic narrator is signaled by ‘I’ and action verbs and occurs in the following lines about a battle scene which led to Hassan’s death: ‘He died too in the battle broil, / One cry to Mahamet for aid, / One prayer to Alla all he made; / He knew and crossed me in the fray - / I gazed upon in where he lay’ (“The Giaour” In Pocock, 1948: 178). The phrase he ‘knew’ which directs attention to Hassan would suggest that the intradiegetic narrator and the character knew each other. In addition, ‘I gazed’ directs attention to the narrator and equally places him/her in the plot as one of the characters in the story performing the activity of gazing. The description of the scene of Hasan’s death, as well as the narrator’s reactions at the point of death, are likely to trigger the impression of the presence of someone on the scene of events as eyewitness. At this point in the narration, the construction of the intradiegetic narrator is moreover aided by action and perceptual verbs from which the story is oriented such as ‘I gazed’, ‘and watch’d his spirit ebb away: / I search’d, but vainly search’d to find. In the further illuminating passages, the homodiegetic narrator of “The Giaour” identified as ‘I’ continues to provide enhancing clues necessary for the construction of his/her identity as a participant in the story he/she is recounting. The device ‘I’ constitutes an illustrative aspect of homodiegetic narration. This occurs in the passage describing the narrator’s physical confrontation with the ghost of Leila: ‘I saw her; yes she lived again; / And shinning in her white symar, / I saw her, friar! And I rose / Forgetful of our former woes; / And rushing from my couch I dart, / And clasp her to my desperate heart; / No breathing form within my grasp, / No heart that beats
reply to mine’ (“The Giaour” In Pocock, 1948: 183). The narrator tells us in the above lines that he/she ‘saw’ the ghost of Leila, embraced it, and even spoke to it and it mysteriously transformed into a shadow. It is the fact that he is situated in action and performed the activity of seeing that makes the narrator central to the plot. One important thing to direct attention to is the fact that the three intradiegetic narrators- the fisherman, the monk and the Giaour are placed in the story events, telling the story of other people; but most of the time of their personal experiences. Even though at times some of them claim omniscient knowledge of knowing for certain what went on in the minds of other characters, narratives provided by Giaour and the Monk are embedded in the primary discourse of the narration. This makes the narrative of “The Giaour” multifaceted and complex while at the same time foregrounding the construction of a narrative mediation that is controlled from external and from within the diegesis or plot. In addition to self references in the first-person singular action verbs constitute obvious manifestations of the narrating characters named above, and can be taken as fundamental markers for homodiegetic narration.

A prominent narrative technique which rewardingly lends itself to any interpretation of the first stanzas of “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” III as homodiegetic and permits a forging of certain functions is the self-narrative device of simultaneous present tense narration. While the question of how ‘the experiencing ‘I’ evolves into the narrating ‘I’’ (Phelan 1994: 223) is central to my analysis of homodiegetic narration, such an interpretation of narrative perspective would highlight the productiveness of tense categories in marking a narrative situation as first-person text. The issue of multiple narrating voices in “Child’s Harold’s Pilgrimage” as a whole has been raised by Kirchner (1973: 86): ‘Although all voices speak as ‘I’, the basic attitudes in this regard serve to distinguish them one from one another.’ Kirchner is referring specifically to what she calls the ‘bardic’ voice and that of Harold (1973: 87). Kirchner (1973: 81) has certainly read Harold and the narrator as two opposed aspects of the

---

222 See also Hühn (2005: 153) in a useful analysis of certain romantic poems. He identifies instances where reading poems by the use of the present tense and first person pronouns may suggest ‘the identity of narrator (speaker) and protagonist as well as the coincidence of voice and focalisation through simultaneous narration, and may create the illusion of immediacy, spontaneity, authenticity. For more on simultaneous narration, see Fleischman (1990). It is also worth noting that Cohn’s (1998: 97) concern for the uses of the ‘unacknowledged’ first person present tense narration in fiction and non fiction- alike has led her in an illuminating article ‘I doze and wake’: The deviance of simultaneous narration’ to challenge narrative theorists like Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 89), Paul Ricoeur (1995 [1984]: 98) and Fleischman (1990: 23-24; 32; 306) who seem to share a common illusion that narration presupposes pastness. Joining Cohn, my analysis of fragment’s of “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” III, “Lara” and “The Corsair” are in attempt to show that the past tense narrative norm advocated by Ricoeur, Fleischman, and Rimmon-Kenan is inadequate to account for forms and functions that tense styles make available for interpreting narration in poetry.
same personality. Elledge (1968: 55) in a footnote has also raised the point that ‘Child Harold is a series of [...] symbolic projection of the ego into the external world’. The above interpretations of the poem are very significant because only through such evidence can one determine narratological evidence that exists as early analysis of the poem, as well as point out the relative restrictions in such readings. The question Kirchner in particular left unanswered is that of how homodiegetic narration enters the poetic text.

The stanzas in which the the narrating ‘I’ of “Child’s Harold’s Pilgrimage” III (Pocock 1948: 66) narrates his emotional experiences which constitute isolation, joy, passion, and pain are narrated in the present tense involving spontaneity and immediacy: ‘Since my young days of passion-joy, or pain’/ I would essay as I have song to sing.’ Notice that both the narrating and experiencing voice identifies him/herself as ‘I’in the above lines. In claiming to ‘sing’ a song, a ‘dreary strain’, with the voice of his youth, the narrator evokes the past as thought it were present (Cohn 1978: 157), although the tense deployed is the present tense. The further impression that the narrating self evokes the illusion of another self is suggested in the following lines of the poem:

Soul of my thought! with whom I traverse earth,
Invisible but gazing, as I glow
Mix’d with thy spirit, blended with thy birth,
And feeling still with thee in my crush’d feelings’ dearth.

(Byron, “Child’s Harold’s Pilgrimage” III:VI. In: Pocock 1948: 67)

In the above lines, the impression of spontaneity and immediacy is created by the present tense device ‘traverse’ ‘gazing’, and ‘feeling’. Experience and narration appear to be consonant also for the reason that the narrating self and the experiencing self marked by ‘I’are performing the actions of gazing, (the psychological action of) ‘feeling’ and narrating simultaneously revealing no sense of extended time lapse: ‘And feeling still with thee in my crush’d feelings’ dearth.’ In this kind of narration, experience or action is seen to be on going with telling, creating the impression, that the experiencing self of the agent initiating the action is the narrating self. This suits narratological description of simultaneous narration.

An interpretation of the text as first-person homodiegetic narration can also be backed by the narrative device called simultaneous or consonant self-narration, which is important for representing consciousness in first-person texts. Evidence of the presence of the device is supported by the concurrence of action and telling and is justified by the fact that the narrator remains one and the same agent ‘I’ moving under separate identities: ‘Soul of my thought! with whom I traverse earth, / Mix’d with thy spirit, / And feeling still with thee in my crush’d
feelings’ (‘Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage’ III, In Pocock, 1948: 67). In these sentences, the narrating voice is still the same, but the reader finds that another invisible agent has set the stage for an interpretation of narration as simultaneous with action, experience and perception. The first part of ‘Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage’ III in which the speaker recounts his/her adventure provides a good ground to stage simultaneous narration:

Awakening with a start,
The waters heave around me; and on high
The winds lift up their voices: I depart,
Whither I know not; but the hour’s gone by,
When Albion’s lessening shores could grieve or glad mine eye.


If the ‘existential’ (Lothe 2000: 24) pronoun reference, the present tense device ‘I’, and active engagement in plot or action-oriented narrative sentences (Bal 1985) constitute criteria for staging telling as immediate and simultaneous with action and experience, then the above stanza is a lucid example. Although the long Canto of “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” III is dominantly narrated in the authorial voice, stanza’s like the one above places the narrator temporarily in action as character, performing the action, causing events and speaking about them in his/her own voice. Such a manner of narration should not pass unnoticed considering the significance it has for interpreting narration as simultaneous and homodiegetic. The initial phrases ‘Awakening with a start, / The waters heave around me / The winds lift up their voices / I depart’ already set the narrative projecting a personal experience which is ongoing with telling. The first thing to notice is that the narrator puts himself in the story as a character narrating his experiences by naming himself in the linguistic markers such as ‘I’, ‘me’, and ‘mine’, thereby personalizing his narration. Secondly, action verbs occur in the present tense form testified in the words ‘Awakening’, ‘depart’, as well as in the deictic adverbs ‘around me’, and ‘the hour is gone by’. A sense of spontaneity and immediacy is thus invoked although psychological vocabulary is absent. Thirdly, temporal adverbs like ‘around me’ are further manifestations of the physical presence of the narrating agent in action at the present moment of narration. There is an underlying suggestion that the narrator is himself the main

223 Generally speaking, first-person-oriented narratives have typical models which constitute conventional narrative features that tend to foreground a ‘correspondingly readerly expectation’ (Jahn 2005: N3.3.15) indubitably, and first person discourse. ‘I’ entirely participates in action. The narrative begins in the first person voice, which recedes permanently to the background giving way for a third person (authorial narrator) which takes on with the introduction of the hero in the third person. Those who expect a distinction in narrative situations like Genette, Stanzel, Cohn and other structuralists or post structuralists will call this deviant narration. I see this type of narration as productive since the two voices narrate differently, hence constitute different meanings.
character or protagonist of the story or actions he is causing and recounting at same time hence a sense of immediacy and authenticity that often characterize simultaneous narration is invoked. The fact that experience and telling are on going is one way Byron’s poetry provides parameters for constructing homodiegetic narration.

Further clues that action and narration are on going are still sustained in the present tense, the grammatical ‘I’ reference as well as in adverbs of time and place:

Once more upon the waters! yet once more!
And the waves bound beneath me as a steed
That knows his rider. Welcome to their roar!
Swift be their guidance, wheresoe’er it lead!
Still must I on; for I am as a weed,
Flung from the rock, on Ocean’s foam, to sail
Where’er the surge may sweep,
the tempest’s breath prevail.

(Byron, II).

The first signal that experience is concurrent with telling is the use of present tense in ‘welcome’, ‘bound’, and ‘am’. The perceptual emphasis which is also important as a distinguishing characteristic of simultaneous narration is conveyed in images of ‘winds’ and ‘waters’ which ‘could grieve or glad’ the speaker’s eye. The speaker’s perception of his predicament is particularly conveyed in images that suggest lack of vegetation such as the ‘weed’, which when ‘flung flung from the rock, ‘on ocean’s foam, to sail’, is left at the mercy of uncontrollable nature forces like the tempest. The images of the ‘waves’ that knows its rider, as well as that of the ‘weed’ at the mercy of ocean tides which all suggest Harold’s desperation merit further attention here. The association of vegetation with barreness is a mental process of imagination and takes place in the mind since making analogies is an act of imagination. The images reveal that the speaker’s mind (where imagist associations take place) becomes a temporal setting for events, and at the same time suggest that imagination is simultaneous with telling. While nature images emphasize the helplessness of the speaker’s present situation, the yoking together of physical and mental experience in metaphoric analogy may also suggest that imagination, reflection, or focalization is ongoing with narration, and constitute grounds for constructing simultaneous narration in first-person poems.

Albion shores constitute the speaker’s perception of the world of nature, which ambivalently ‘grieve’ and ‘glad’ his eyes. The speaker seems to be sensitive even to the metaphysical impressions that nature is capable of impacting on his feelings. Apparently aware of his predicament, he conveys his desperation, dejection, and loneliness in the
beautiful metaphor of vegetation rejected by rocks; ‘I am as a weed, / Flung from the rock; on ocean’s foam to sail where’er the surge may sweep’ (II). Similarly, the simile and the personification of the ‘waves beneath’ in the image of a horse (‘steed’) that is familiar and ‘knows his rider’ can only lead the reader to picture an ongoing story, which is rendered simultaneously with the focalization activity of imagination.

While both action-oriented phrases in the present tense (‘Awakening with a start’), the deictics and temporal adverbs (‘around me’, ‘beneath me’); the linguistic ‘I’ or ‘me’ as well as the mental or perceptual action of imagination suggested in the simile and metaphoric patterns may emphasize performative aspects of narration, they contribute to suggest that an important function of simultaneous narration is the location of the homodiegetic voice in the story. In other words, these devices put the narrator in the present moment of action. Hence one begins to assume that narration is structured in a tone inside the story. Most importantly, the clues contribute to the characterization of the text itself as first person told by an individualized narrator.

That any act of narration, which is immediate, and consists of purely mental reflections accompanying the ongoing experience are simultaneous224 with events (and thus creates the illusion that perception is ongoing with telling) provides an important narrative mechanism for analyzing narration in Byron’s poetry can be demonstrated with the following psychoalogy:

I am as a weed, 
Flung from the rock, on Ocean’s foam, to sail 
Where’er the surge may sweep, the tempest’s breath prevail.


The mental event in the passage is the act of imagination. The event is immediate as conveyed by the present tense device ‘am’. The act of comparing him/herself to weed, a symbol of vegetation at the mercy of waves (aiming to signal his predicament) is pure imagination. One may be tempted to assume that the narrator of the above lines is thinking in images as conveyed in the image of vegetation deprived of life. The internal tone is marked by the emphasis on ‘I’ and suggests internal perspective, and further marks the text as a first person communicated by the experiencing agent. The reader is unavoidably made aware that the personalized narrator is communicating events he is both imagining and causing since making psychic or mental associations often goes with the activity of imagination. If the agent who

imagines in imagistic association associates the lack of vegetation with a state of desperation, then imagination and narration are not only simultaneous. They also serve to reveal the function of present tense aspects in constructing a narrative situation in the first person.225

That Byron’s narrative poems create grounds for new ways of staging narration as retrospective (dissonant from the perspectives of the narrating self and the experience self) and therefore homodiegetic is nowhere evident than in the first stanza of “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” (III: I) in which the narrator recalls with intimacy his separation from his daughter:

Is thy face like thy mother’s, my fair child!
ADA! sole daughter of my house and heart?
When last I saw thy young blue eyes they smiled,
And then we parted,-not as now we part,
But with a hope.-226

(Byron, “Child Harold’s Pilgrimage” III. In: Pocock 1948: 66)

By associating the narrating ‘I’ with Ada, Byron has only created grounds for critics like Jump (1972: 76) to identify this narrator with himself. But it will be erroneous to side with Jump in interpreting narration as linked to the author. In challenging the illusion of Byron’s intrusion into the poem created by Jump I am attempting to ask and answer the question of which narrative voice can be constructed from the above text. One may likely wonder if the narrating self recounts what he ‘saw’ long ago at the time of departure from Ada, or what he is thinking at the present moment of narration-the ‘now’ while he tells this event. The expression ‘When I last saw thy young blue eyes they smiled’ / ‘not as now we part’ tells the reader about the time of narration. ‘Saw’ indicates time past and ‘now’ signals the present moment of narration. The homodiegetic narrator’s apparent temporal relationship to his past self is signaled by the verb ‘saw’. The fusion of the past and present feelings of the narrator reveals that narration is not retrospective as the verb ‘saw’ might mislead the reader to assume. The deictic ‘now’ is the device that marks the temporal distance between the time the experiencing self ‘saw’ Ada and the present moment that the narrator recalls and recounts the experience. In the expression – ‘When I last saw thy young blue eyes they smiled, / And then

225 Fleischman (1990), Ricoeur (1995 [1984]), etc would consider this a deviant narration considering their insistence that stories are narrated only after they had occurred. This is however also a productive and fresh way of analysing narration in the first person.

226 Critics like W. H. Marshall (1962) had erroneously conflated the narrating voice here with Byron’s arguing that the stanza is a reflection of his separation scandal, corroborating his claims with the opinion that Byron was constructing his state of mind when he left England after the separation scandal. Narratological interpretation above reveals fresh ways of constructing homodiegetic narration. In the light of this study, Marshall’s opinion has less to do with narratological considerations in the light of narration per se.
we parted’, the past tense construction (‘saw’, and ‘parted’) - creates the illusion that the narrator is recounting an event he witnessed in the past. Even though the psychic event marked by ‘saw’ was experienced by the experiencing self, the point of view expressed in ‘now’ seems to be that of the narrating self. Both ‘saw’ and the temporal deictic ‘now’ are therefore grounds to speak about the temporal and psychological lapse of time when the narrator saw Ada and his impressions at the time of narration. The reader is likely to presume that the narrator is one and the same person since the narrating voice remains in the first person ‘I’. What Byron has successfully done here in the examples above, and as in the poem as a whole\(^\text{227}\) appears to be that he not only creates conducive grounds for critics like Kirchner (1973) to describe the poem as a juxtaposition of voices,\(^\text{228}\) but also offers opportunity for interpreting first-person texts. A critic like Cohn (1978: 157) will likely conclude that the narrator evokes the past as though it were present, no matter whether he uses the past or the present tense. Such a distinction implies that the narrating self and the experiencing self perform different functions - the experiencing self ‘saw’ the eyes because he was present in the story, but the narrating self remembers and recounts the event. In arguing as such, one is also raising the crucial question of productive ways Byron’s poetry constructs narrative. Simultaneous narration has created the illusion of double narration but is productive in the development of the identities of first, the experiencing and the narrating self, and second, the first person and third person narrators, as well as for their differentiations. It is also evident that the technique is productive in the sense that it generates a range of possible meanings. By so doing, Byron’s poetry, like this study provides innovative models of describing homodiegetic narration.

In the manner of the first part of the “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” III, Mazeppa, another monologue, provides narrative strategies that point towards retrospective (dissonant) self narration, while creating grounds for the reader to see perspective structure, which is, to this study, another hallmark of homodiegetic narration, in manifestation. Although he said it

\(^{227}\) Kirchner (1973: 81, 82) has read the entire three cantos (with the exception of the fourth which she acknowledges is narrated by the narrator exclusively as conflict of voices (apparently) between the narrator-protagonist relationship; or a combination of ‘various voices’ Byron himself seems to have predicted that his poem would be judged as such because in the manner of Kirchner’s, and Marshall’s (1962) readings, he commits the same error of attributing the voices inherent in the canto’s to himself, the poet, and the ‘pilgrim’ or his second self: ‘I had become weary of drawing a line which everyone seemed determined not to perceive […] it was in vain that I asserted, and imagined that I had drawn a distinction between author and the pilgrim […]’ (Kirchner 1973: 80).

\(^{228}\) Marshall (1962) sees the third person voice, as that of the protagonist and antagonist. Kirchner (1973) finds both Byron, the narrator, and Harold.
in passing, Marshall (1962: 123) had foregrounded this type of narrative situation constructed in Mazzepa as suggested by the following remarks:

In the intensity of his recollection he moves from the past tense to the Present [...] and in his strong underlying desire to yoke two experiences he makes reference to the present situation from remembrance of the past.

The very remark that Mazeppa evokes the past in the present from 'remembrance' or memory brings Marshall's interpretation closer to what Cohn (1978: 145; 155) calls 'retrospective narration' (to describe a narrator turning back to his past self which was confused and ignorant), although this is only inferred. Whether my conjecture proves to be true or false, the reader is invited to take a close look at the text below and the accompanying explanations that are intended to give an idea of the kind of retrospective self-narration "Mazeppa" constructs as well as the impact of the technique for my analysis of narration. Starting the analysis with the claim that Mazeppa is himself the homodiegetic (autodiegetic) narrator of the poem, I will like to draw the reader’s attention to the speaker’s expressions from the very beginning of the poem. Mazeppa begins his narration in the manner of what Kirchner (1973: 66) describes as ‘personal reminiscence’. While such a remark may be understood to mean a narrator telling a story of his life, his past experience, the phrase implicitly foregrounds the use of retrospective narration in the poem. The first sentence which projects Mazeppa’s self conscious attempts to retrieve from memory events of his life fifty years back contains attributes often regarded in the narratological sense as hall marks of retrospective narration: ‘Well, [...] I’ll track / My seventy years of memory back: / I think ‘twas [...] my twentieth spring’ (IV). The first-person singular marker ‘I’, the present tense in ‘I’ll’, and ‘think’, as well as the term ‘memory’ are already indications of the present self’s attempts to recreate his past through narration. The scene where the narrator recollects what happened long ago in his youth when he admired a woman provides narratological grounds to see the technique of dissonant self-narration in practice:

For I had strength, youth, gaiety,
A port, not like to this ye see,
But smooth, as all is rugged now;
For time, and care, and war, have plough’d
My very soul from out my brow;
[...]
Had taken my features for his page:
With years, ye know, have not declined
My strength, my courage, or my mind,
Or at this hour I should not be
Telling old tales beneath a tree,
With starless skies my canopy.
But let me on: Theresa’s form-
Methinks it glides before me now,
At the present moment of narration, the narrator is ‘seventy years’, but he is also wiser and different from the days of old. The use of the first-person singular pronoun ‘my’ and ‘methinks’ (a form of self-quotation) is consistent with the linguistic devices that are markers of self-narration. It is again the relationship of the two selves of the narrator that is constructed in the poem. The relationship is not only a temporal one, but it is also psychological. Memory (‘methinks’) is used to create the past. The temporal deictic ‘now’ occurs two times in the passage, and could be interpreted as an attempt by the narrating self to describe and distinguish his past which was characterized by ‘strength, youth, gaiety’ from the point of view of the present self which is ‘rugged now’. Similarly, memory as suggested in ‘methinks’ is also invoked to recollect the lady he once loved - ‘Theresa’s a form- / Methinks it glides before me now’. Of importance is the fact that the narrator fuses his past (retrospective narration) with what he is thinking at the present moment of narration suggested by ‘now’. At the same time the narrator attempts to record the past by means of past tense reference “had”, the present tense devices concurrently occur in adverbs of time and place such as ‘like to this’, ‘see’, ‘is all rugged now’, and also in the adverb ‘beneath’ (V).

The long section in which the homodiegetic narrator recounts his love affair provides more evidence. At the time the narrating self is telling ‘old tales beneath a tree’, Theresa’s form is recalled- ‘methinks it glides before me now’, / Between me and yon chestnut’s bough’ “Mazeppa” V. Again memory is invoked to recall the lady who was so admired and loved: ‘The memory is so quick and warm; / She had the Asiatic eye, / Dark as […] the sky’ (V). Quickly he goes back memory lane again: ‘We met-we gazed. I saw, and sigh’d / I saw, and sigh’d-in silence wept, / The being whom I loved most! / I watch’d her as a sentinel’ (VI). The relationship between the narrating self and the experiencing self is very primordial here. The self that saw events happen and the self that narrates are one and the same person (‘I’) but are only separated by past tense indicators such as “gazed”, and “saw”. Narration shuffles from the past to the present thoughts. The past is conveyed in mental vocabulary such as “gazed”, and “saw” and in action verbs such as ‘had’, ‘met’, ‘gazed’, loved’, and ‘watch’d’ (VI). But the narrator’s present feelings are couched in the present tense devices and imagistic patterns. For example, the intimacy with which the narrator now pictures Theresa is conveyed in the mental or suggestive image of ‘young hearts and minds’ absorbing ‘electric wire’ and fire’ (VI). While it is the young Mazeppa who saw the lady and could not bring himself to
reconcile with her seductive advances, it is the old self of Mazeppa picturing the event in images, deictics, and present tense devices. And because the narrator is mature and realistic, his knowledge about fate does not prevent him from still loving his lost mistress (cf. Kirchner 1973: 70). The narrator tells us that he “loved her” in the story time, and “still” loves her now, hence initiating a manner of narration that conforms to our understanding of retrospective narration: ‘I loved her then / I love her still. / We meet in secret doubly sweet’ (VII). It is, in Kirchner’s (1973: 69) words, “the elder Mazeppa who now realises that what he thought was fate was actually the conjunction of fortuitous circumstances”. The impression created is that the narrator recollects the past from the perspective of his present thoughts. In the accounts of how Mazeppa dated Theresa, evidence of participation in the seductive event is emphasized; and also of Theresa’s responses. In addition to the uses of the past tense, both the ‘then’ which signals the past and ‘Still’ which stands for the present moment of narration creates a sense of extended time frame, and also functions to reveal the temporal distance between the two selves.

In the above analysis, emphasis is also on the devices that create the impression that the perspective of the past self is embedded in the present self of the homodiegetic narrator. Mental and cognitive devices occur in many instances of the poem as evidence of the fact that although the two selves are fused by the first-person pronoun, the perspective of the experiencing self is fused in that of the narrating self. My first illustrative example is the narrating self’s use of the deictic ‘now’ to signal the differences between the way the narrator perceives himself now as opposed to his past: ‘I was goodly stripling then; / At seventy years I so may say, / But […] all is rugged now’ (IV). Secondly, in one of my examples quoted above about the projection of love passion in the image of heat or fire, I tried to show how the present self of the homodiegetic narrator thinks in images to separate his present thoughts from the past thoughts. Besides evidence of imagistic patterns, a profusion of instances of self – quotations can account for, to adopt Cohn’s (1978: 151) words ‘the cognitive privilege of the narrating over the experiencing self’. In the narrator’s description of his lover, it is his present thoughts that are quoted to demarcate them from past thoughts: ‘Methinks it glides before me now.’ Again, it is the opinion of the narrating voice that when he watched the dark eyes of the loved one, her features seemed fused with the forces of nature - ‘She had the Asiatic eye / Dark as above us in the sky / Like the moonrise of midnight; / Which seem’d to melt to its own beam’ (V). There is in the above description what narratology regards as the
relationship between the present time personalized and selfconscious narrator – ‘I’, and past
time character – ‘I’ (in a first-person retrospective narration\textsuperscript{229} typical of most first-person
autobiographical narratives). Both imagistic associations and cognitive verbs such as
‘methinks’, ‘think’, and ‘memory’ are further hallmarks of self narration that provide grounds
to stage perspective structure in first-person narrated poems. The potential of the device of
self narration in constructing a homodiegetic narrative situation can be assessed from the
above analysis.

In the description of the mad ride across the desert, it is still the present time narrator-
the narrating ‘I’ who evokes his past as a present event: ‘But now I doubted strength and
speed’ (“Mazeppa”: XII). “Now” is again used to picture the past as if it were present. The
narrating self has changed from the past when he/she experienced events as the experiencing
self: ‘And I was then not what I seem’ (XIII). The impression created is that the narrating self
knows what happened to him at the various stages of his mad ride and tells it, and is therefore
the protagonist of his own story, to appropriate Cohn’s (1978: 155) words in a different
context. In view of the use of clues such as temporal deictics, pronouns in the first-person
singular, past tense signals, mental vocabulary and memory devices, the reader is in a position
to determine the kind of narration that is constructed as well as attribute voice and
perspective.

Verbs and explicit affirmations of participation in love making are strategies in
“Mazeppa” that would seem to suggest the presence of a homodiegetic voice. When they
‘meet’ and ‘gazed’ at each other, what Mazeppa ‘saw’ and experienced were signs of
“involuntary sparks of thought” (VI), which he interpretes as passion for sex. This is
conveyed in the image of fire in his blood: ‘The burning charm / conveying as the electric
wire, / the absorbing fire – (VI). This feeling, to the narrator ‘has now become a symbol of the
days of youth and peace’ (Kirchner 1973: 69). In the story, the narrating self, his love,
experiences and actions thus become central. The romantic experience is recounted
retrospectively. When Mazeppa turns attention to the Page, he realizes how much better off he
was when he ‘was lord / of one soft heart, and his own sword’ (VII) (Kirchner 1973: 70). He
recounts the peoples’s reactions when they discovered that he had an affair with Theresa:

\begin{quote}
For lovers there are many eyes,  
And such there were on us;-
But one fair night, some lurking spies
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{229} Cf. McHale (1981)
Surprised and seized us both  
I was unarmed;  
All cap-pie from head to heel,  
They led me to the castle gate:  
Theresa’s doom I never knew,  
Our lot was henceforth separate  

(Byron, VIII)

The narrator was tied to a horse and driven out to ride and die in the wilderness:

To me the desert – born was led’  
They bound me on, that menial throng,  
Upon his back with many a thong;  
They loosed him with a sudden lash-  
Away: away! and on we dash!  
my breath was gone-  
I saw not where we hurried on:

(Byron, IX).

The use of the linguistic marker ‘I’ indicates that narration is homodiegetic and tone internal. The homodiegetic narrator’s manner of narrating which includes assertions about his behavior, the torments he received, what he knew or did not know, his banishment from the land, the people’s attitude towards them (‘surprised’) and the punishment inflicted on him makes it obvious that the development of the plot is structured around the experiences of the narrating self.

In the interpretation of the role of perspective in guiding an understanding of homodiegetic narration, readers may also make recourse to the further passages of “Mazeppa”. In the scene describing the ridiculous, derisive and disreputing treatment meted on Mazeppa by his enemies, it is his opinion at the moment of telling that appears central:

The last of human sounds which rose,  
As I was darted from my foes,  
Was the wild shout of savage laughter,  
Which on the wind came roaring after

(Byron, “Mazeppa”: X. In: Pocock 1948: 406)

The opinion that the derisive laughter whose echoes were transmitted by the wind was ‘wild’ and ‘savage’ appears to be that of the narrating self. This mockery almost set Mazeppa mad; but what is important here is the fact that all the descriptions are important as they put the narrator in action and create the impression of one inside the story recounting a tale of personal experience.

The impression that the interpreter of events is the actor himself, the narrating self and therefore an autodiegetic narrator of the poem is sustained in the following lines from
“Mazeppa” describing his ride especially when he uses the metaphor of thunder to emphasize his speed:

With sudden wrath I wrench’d my head,
And snapp’d the cord, which to the mane
Had bound my neck in lieu of rein,
And, writhing half my form about,
Howl’d back my curse; but midst the tread,
The thunder of my courser’s speed,
It vexes me [...].

(Byron, “Mazeppa”: X. In: Pocock 1948: 406)

The expression of the narrator’s anger in the present tense ‘it vexes me’ is again a distancing strategy that separates the present feelings of the narrating self from the moment he saw events at the time of occurrence. It is also in the description of wild ride that Mazeppa further individualizes himself as the protagonist of his own story by means of the singular pronoun ‘I’.

That “Mazeppa” is a typical example of how perspective creates self-narration and can thus become a strategy for the staging of homodiegetic narration is again backed by imagistic patterns or psychoanalogies. An example occurs when the narrator describes his exhaustion from his wild ride in the image of rain: ‘And my cold sweat-drops fell like rain’ (XI). The comparison of the narrator’s sweat to ‘rain’ to emphasize the exhaustion and tedious nature of the ride is the perspective of the narrating self at the moment he recalls and recounts the events. The ride was long, tedious, and tormenting:

My limbs; and
I found strength to bear
My wounds already scar’d
with cold
We rustled through the leaves like wind
left shrubs, and trees, and wolves behind;
by night I heaved them on the track, until he ‘wish’d’
for a spear or sword
By now I doubted strength and speed’

(Byron, XII).

The ‘now in the expression ‘but now I doubted strength and speed (XII) should not mislead the reader to attribute the feelings and opinion to the narrating self. The ‘now’ is that of the experiencing self; the past self that experienced the tedious ride as suggested in past tense references such as ‘was’, ‘found’, ‘rustled’, ‘wish’d’. The imagination (which is the mental activity caused by the narrating self and which therefore signals his/her presence) is introduced in the image of the wind with which the ride is compared to suggest its speedy nature. The deictic adverb ‘now’ which marks off the perspective of the experiencing self
from that of the narrating self (introduced by means of psychoanalogies) is the same means by which the perspective of the former is embedded in that of the latter. In addition, verbs of speculative cognition featuring in 'seem’d': ‘I seem’d to sink up upon the ground / I was not then what I seem,’ (XIII) are further indicators of perspective as well as distancing strategies that mark the narrator of the text as the wiser and mature agent.

The scene from “Mazeppa” which describes the protagonist’s actions, experiences and feelings during the tedious ride in the desert provides another opportunity to stage homodiegetic narration by means of devices that suggest perspective structure and active participation in the story’s plot:

I seem’d to sink upon the ground;
But err’d, for I was fastly bound.
My heart turn’d sick, my brain grew sore,
And throbb’d awhile, then beat no more:
The skies spun like a mighty wheel;
I saw the trees like drunkards reel,
And a slight flash sprang o’er my eyes,
Which saw no farther: he who dies
Can die no more than then I died.
O’ertotur’d by that ghastly ride,
I felt the blackness come and go.
And strove to wake; but could not make
My senses climb up from below:
I felt as on a plank at sea,
[…]
My undulating life was as
The fancied lights that flitting pass
Our shut eyes in deep midnight, when
Fever begins upon the brain:

(Byron, “Mazeppa” XIII., In: Pocock 1948: 410)

The reader’s attention needs to be tilted towards action and mental verbs like, ‘spun’, ‘saw’, and ‘felt’ which occur more than once to stress active involvement in the plot by the narrating self. The association of the confusion in the mind of the narrator at the time of experiencing to the sky turning like a wheel not only make the opinion of the older self; the psychoanalysis also embeds the perspective of the former in the latter’s. Again when the narrator’s unconsciousness and mental confusions are conveyed in the image of a brain tormented by fever attacks, the point of view can again be seen as that of narrating self. When the narrator revives from his trance, he fancies himself crossing a stream in which he imagines that he underwent rejuvenation: ‘My thoughts came back; / My stiffen’d limbs were rebaptiz’d’ (XIV). The mental verbs ‘felt’ and ‘I thought’ are markers of memory. The experiencing self witnessed the events in the story time because he was present on the scene of the ride. The narrating self only remembers what he saw as signaled by memory devices.
Self quoted references, described by Cohn (1978: 161) as occasional quotation of past thoughts is also another prominent device used in “Mazeppa” for describing narration in the first person. An example occurs when Mezappa’s ‘thoughts came back’, during his description of the process of revival from a state of unconsciousness when he fell in a trance during his wide ride: ‘My thoughts came back; where was I? / Methought the dash of waves was nigh’ (XIV). Until this point in the narration, Mazeppa has been describing his wide ride and the trance-like experience. The quotation marks in the above sentences mark off the monologue from narration. The impression created is that the narrator quotes his past thoughts to separate them from his present thoughts. The situation created here fits analogously into Cohn’s (1978: 162) remark that in retrospective narration:

A wise old narrator is therefore especially careful to separate the half-baked mental essays of his youth from his present wisdom by explicit, sometimes ironic comment.

Such a manner of narrating can only push critics like Kirchner (1973: 76) to remark that Mezeppa is relieving a phase of his life rather than recounting a narrative. Such occasions of self-quotations as ‘I thought’, ‘Methought’ are likely to answer questions about the ways the perspective of the experiencing self is embedded in that of the narrating self in the first-person narrative poem. The very clues create the effects of homodiegetic narration and suggest further ways in which Byron’s poetry contributed to the development of narrative techniques.

By convention the reader is aware that as a homodiegetic narrator, Mazeppa has no omniscience often attributed to authorial narration. The younger self of Mezappa at the moment of experience was ignorant and could not know how long the ride took, and the length of time they had stayed at the shore:

> How many hours of night or day
> In those suspended pangs I lay,
> I could not tell; I scarcely knew.
> If this were human breath I drew.

(Byron, “Mazeppa” XIV. In: Pocock 1948: 411)

Even the narrator’s description of the ‘boundless plain’ appears to reveal his lack of complete knowledge: ‘And onward, onward, onward seems’ (XV). The struggle to reach the ‘boundless plain’ ‘seems’, to the narrator, at least in his ‘dreams’, like precipices (XV). Although only implied, Kirchner’s (1973: 64) suggestion that the ‘[t]he story is actually a tale within a tale’ can be understood, in the light of my discussion, to mean that the experiencing self and its perspective is embedded in the perspective of the narrating self since the latter retrieves his past thoughts by means of perceptual devices. In the manner of “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage”
III, “Mazeppa” employs narrative strategies that can draw the reader’s attention to dissonant self narration, while creating grounds for an understanding of the role of character-perspective in constructing a narrative situation as homodiegetic. Such a narrative device can only solicit such interpretations of attempting to yoke two experiences of the same self to create a narrative situation in the first-person.

What is important in the analysis of “The lament of Tasso”, “The Prophecy of Dante”, “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” III, “Mazeppa”, “Churchill’s Grave” and “The Prisoner of Chillon” is that the dramatic monologue device, tense styles, self narration devices, linguistic markers, action-oriented verbs, perspective structure, unreliability, parallipsis and other techniques can only lead the reader to see narratology at work in poetry in the sense that the devices allow for an understanding of how homodiegetic narration is constructed. Categories like the linguistic ‘I’, homodiegetic narration, authorial (heterodiegetic narration), communal voice and culture-narrating objects including their approximate textual strategies bring in both issues of culture and the narrative tradition into the poems analysed above. Also, the more culture-specific and cognitive (psychological) forms of constructing narration apply here. Hence they combine to constitute some ways by which transgeneric narratology can be extended and made meaningful in the analysis of Byron’s narrative verse. The introduction of narrative mediation in poetry through narrative devices also points toward a major innovation in the genre of romantic poetry and suggests that Byron’s poetry was experimenting with the narrative tradition. In view of the above, can one then conclude that Byron’s frank assertions of experimenting with the narrative tradition (cited at the beginning of the study) and my hypothetical claims of making narratology work in a poetic context are most fully realized by means of the above narrative techniques? In other words, the techniques by which the the first-person narrator enters the poetic text lead to an understanding of his/her functions. For the most part, the very techniques analysed above can allow for a construction of homodiegetic narration.
3. An Analysis of the Uses of the Figural Mode in Poetry

What if Literature began to concern itself more with spiritual states than with engagements, dances, excursions to the country and accidents for their own sake [...]? We would get to know more about the secret stirrings that go unnoticed in the remote parts of the mind, the incalculable chaos of impressions, the delicate life of the imagination seen under the magnifying-glass; the random wandering of thoughts and feelings, untrodden trackless journeyings by brain and heart [...]

Cohn (1978: 158)

What is [...] required of a novel is that the ‘feel of life’ of the fictional characters should be created, the feel of the choices open to them; a moral evaluation, if it is to be genuine and valid, can emerge only from the possibilities of their world, their personality, their mode of experience. These objectives are achieved only if the reader can get ‘within the skin’ of the characters, can see and understand in their terms, from their perspective, without of course sacrificing his own objective position. No more, then, of the Olympian author who delivers judgments from outside the story [...] in one sense diminishing the presence and powers of the author, in another increasing his responsibilities, [...]

Roy Pascal (1977: 5-6)

Narrative devices for representing both consciousness and the mind (including emotions, moods, and other mental states) in general can be productive in the reading, interpretation, construction, and analysis of figural narration in Byron’s poetry. The question of which particular transgeneric-narrative categories (for the representation of consciousness) are suitable for constructing figural narration is the focus of this chapter. This presupposes an attempt to identify mental devices for staging psychic processes and other areas of the mind in poetry. My aim is to throw light on the role consciousness representation categories²³⁰ may

²³⁰ I use consciousness here in the narrower sense to imply in Cohn’s (1978) words techniques for the representation of consciousness in narratives. Cohn (1978) uses the term ‘consciousness representation’ categories as part of the title of her book, and it is worthy of note that her terminology and the scope of thought categories it provides has been very instrumental in shaping my thinking on the reconceptualization of transgeneric narratology.
play in narrative construction of meaning in poetry and to eventually sustain my central argument that Byron’s poetry provides features for constructing narration and specific cultures. In so doing, the study may throw light on specific elements of Byron’s poetry that can be analysed narratologically, and consequently, the extent to which my innovative transgeneric narratological theory of mediation can prove its merits in the analysis of narration in Byron’s poetry. To find grounds to justify my hypothetical claim that consciousness representation strategies are narrative means by which figural narration can be staged in Byron’s poetry (in a bid to speak about its strategies of manifestations and analytical functions), this section would require as a starting point a brief explanation of textual markers by which figural narration can be identified and analyzed to construct meaning. A good starting point for any discussion of transgeneric narrative categories of figural mode requires an explanation on the link between the quotations above and the study.

When, in the passage quoted above, Pascal (1977) calls attention to literature that seeks to get ‘within the skin’, he can be understood as raising the important question of how the mind and psychic processes can become sources of literary material. In provoking the crucial question of how the mind and cognitive processes can enter literature, both Cohn and Pascal, in the manner of this study seems to raise the analogous concern of providing consciousness representation categories for staging figural narration and its functions in Byron’s poetry. Cohn (1958: 158) can be understood as raising the crucial question of how literature can construct ‘spiritual states’, ‘the secret stirrings that go unnoticed in the remote parts of the mind’, ‘the random wandering of thoughts and feelings’ including ‘the life of the imagination’. Such a statement is indubitably theoretically inspired and apparently grounded on the narratological illusion that mental processes or thought forms may constitute an integral part of literature as they are suited to provide material for its construction. Cohn’s call for an engagement with literature that focuses on ‘spiritual states’, the ‘mind’, ‘thoughts and feelings’, and ‘imagination’ also points towards the debated question of the relationship between the mind and narrative, and also calls to mind her fundamental concern with providing ‘[n]arrative modes for presenting consciousness’ in fiction. This reminds me of a similar observation, quoted in Marchand (1965: 10) that Byron was born of the impulse to ‘look into your heart and write’. Similarly, and most crucially, in one of her essays entitled

231 For more on consciousness representation strategies, see also McHale (1981) and Palmer (2002) for an elaborate discussion on mental strategies of meaning making provided by narratology, philosophy and psychology.
‘The Theory and Practice of Modern Fiction’ (1919), Virginia Woolf\textsuperscript{232} employs the metaphorical image of ‘the flickerings of that innermost flame’ to direct the attention of readers to modern fiction’s concern with inner life and psychological characters in the hope that literature may be able to provide categories to stage and ‘illumine the mind within rather than the world without’.\textsuperscript{233} The image\textsuperscript{234} of ‘myriad of impressions’ or ‘innumerable atoms’ and that innermost flame ‘which flashes its messages through the brain’ not only describes the nature of innermost thoughts but effectively illustrates modern literature’s concern for psychic states\textsuperscript{235} of fictional characters. In addition, Woolf’s association of literature with inner life represents, in the eyes of Freedman (1963: 190), an attempt to examine the structure and conditions of consciousness itself and their effects on the novel. What Pascal, Cohn, and Woolf say of fiction is true of Byron’s poetry considering that it provides narrative features that can be analyzed by means of mental and consciousness representation categories drawn from the insights of narrative theory and transgeneric narratology. In other words, Byron’s narrative verse deals with psychological characters (often associated with modern fiction), and thus constitute a testing ground for transgeneric narratology itself. The notion of inner life as seen in Byron’s poetry is evidently in consonance with Cohn’s (1978) consciousness representations in fiction. His poetry, in many respects, fits Woolf’s understanding of literature that deals with psychic states and suggests the impact of inner life upon the textual world. Needless emphasizing that the above critical comments from Woolf, Cohn and Pascal are thought provoking since they fuel my enthusiasm to engage with the transgeneric narrative categories for staging the reflector mode as part of my investigation into the forms and functions of narration in the analysis of Byron’s poetry. When analyzing the uses of the figural mode in Byron’s poetry, the reader is invited to pay attention to clues by which the figural character can be identified. This leads to a suggestion that the relationship between Byron’s poetry and the mind can only be explained by depending on methodological tools such as psychonarration, free indirect discourse or narrated monologue, stream of consciousness/interior monologue, focalization (treated elsewhere), psychoanalogies, and what may be subsumed under mental vocabulary. Byron’s narrative poems like “The

\textsuperscript{232} For the quotation, see Freedman (1963: 107).
Corsair”, “Lara” and “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” will be used as testing grounds for my argument that figural narration may provide fruitful grounds for the construction of narrative meaning in poetry since the poetry itself contains psychological characters. Since these devices have similar forms of manifestations and perform analogous roles in interpretation and analysis, a discussion of clues to their identification may prove less useful without an idea on how they differ from one another. Of importance is the fact that strategies for staging psychic states occur in two fundamental respects, and needs to be considered separately considering their usefulness for analyzing figural narration in this study. Since devices that are suitable for rendering the character’s states of mind that are not consciousness have been analyzed under authorial narration, attention needs to be focused on those for staging consciousness.

In contradistinction to direct mediation that characterizes authorial heterodiegetic and most first-person texts (homodiegetic, autodiegetic), the narrated world of the figural narrative situation is characterized by perceptions and internal processes and it is these that play a role in determining what is narrated (Nünning/Nünning 2004). What is often dramatized or represented in the figural mode are the subjective impressions and the internal processes of the story-internal character, not physical events and actions. The representation is often done in such a way that the reader has direct and unmediated access into the sensory impressions and consciousness of the perceiving, thinking, feeling (Nünning/Nünning 2004) and one may add dreaming character. In a figural text, it is the internal perspective and the relector character (internal focalizer) that one finds and not the external perspective as in the authorial narrative situation. In an attempt to engage with the question of what strategies of reading and interpretation can one find a relector, Fludernik (1996: 345) proposes cognitive frames of seeing, perceiving and experiencing – what she calls parameters of ‘viewing and experiencing’. Cohn (1978) goes a step further in providing strategies by which thought or consciousness can be represented in both first-person and third-person narrative texts. The techniques will serve, first, as indicators that the agent in the story or plot oriented sentences is a reflector or character inside the story, and second, as strategies for the analysis of the uses of figural narration in Byron’s poetry. The strategies for staging consciousness will offer

---

236 For more on figural narration, see also Wallace Martin (1986: 140), O’Neill (1994), Jahn (1985), Stanzel (1981), Booth (1961: 153), de Jong (2001); see also Cohn (1978); and Michael Toolan (2001 [1988]: 121-142) for speech and thought presentation strategies. Other forms of consciousness have been analysed earlier in the analysis of authorial (heterodiegetic) and first person (homodiegetic) narrations depending on the needs of the particular chapter or section.
the study grounds to speak about the forms and functions of the figural narrative situation in the analysis of Byron’s Poetry. In addition to self-narration techniques already analyzed in the earlier part of this chapter, other consciousness representation devices to be used include the stream of consciousness, interior monologue, free indirect discourse or Cohn’s quoted monologue. The three modes occur relatively frequently in the said poetry, and can generally be identified on the basis of certain characteristics of form and content, although there are admittedly various hybrid and crossover types (cf. Nünning/Nünning 2004: 124-125). Psychonarration indicates a mode of representing consciousness, thoughts or the character’s internal processes in a way that it is easier to discern traces of the narrator’s language. In an almost similar manifestation as free indirect discourse (narrated monologue), the main distinguishing linguistic markers of psychonarration are the use of pronouns in the third person singular and the past tense device. In contrast to free indirect discourse, however, in psycho narration the narrator uses his/her own language (and not that of the character) to summarize a character’s state of mind. Linguistically speaking therefore, both free indirect discourse and psychonarration maintain the third-person references, the past tense of narration (Cohn 1978: 14), and mental vocabulary. Notwithstanding the parallels shared by free indirect discourse (henceforth also referred to as narrated monologue) and psychonarration, what is emphasized in free indirect discourse is the representation of the characters internal processes in his/her own language rather than the narrator’s. Free indirect discourse thus ‘attempts to convey the illusion of offering an immediate insight into the perceptions and internal processes of a character’, and it ‘create[s] this effect by using loose syntax […] including questions, exclamations and other signals of subjectivity’ (Nünning/Nünning, 2004). In addition, the device is often signaled by the past tense signal but there are often ‘no quotation marks’ (Cohn 1978: 111). Free indirect discourse (narrated monologue) will be used in my analysis to stage the forms and functions of the figural mode in Byron’s poems narrated in the third person form.

Interior monologue will be useful for staging figural narration and thus deserves attention here. In contrast to psychonarration and free indirect discourse, interior monologue (also known as quoted monologue in Cohn’s description and occurs in both first-person and

\[\text{References}\]


239 The technique of narrated monologue has been proposed by Cohn (1978: 13) as more suitable for rendering thoughts in third-person contexts.
third-person narrative texts), describes a ‘highly mimetic form of presenting consciousness, in which the thoughts and feelings of a character are ‘quoted’ without any ‘discernible mediating instance’, aiming ‘to create the impression of complete immediacy in their representation of internal processes’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 125). The quoted monologue is similar to free indirect discourse only in the sense that ‘It reproduces verbatim the character’s own mental language’ (Cohn 1978: 14), evading all traces of reportorial clues. The fundamental textual strategies by which interior monologues can be gauged and described (and which are often not employed in free indirect discourse and psychonarration) include, among others, the first person singular and the present tense, staccato rhymes, ellipses, and profuse imagery (which avoid reference to the subject). Further, in order to identify the interior monologue, or even stream of consciousness, the reader must note that what the text constructs is the mental process of a character. Secondly, thoughts and time occur illogically, in fluxes, in the manner described by Virginia Woolf as ‘a myriad of impressions’ or ‘an incessant shower of innumerable atoms’ [...] (Freedman 1963: 190). Other indicators also useful for the study’s analysis of the uses of the device include the omissions of all verbs of thinking and feeling, the complete removal of any mediating instance from the narrative, the presentation of the characters mental processes in his or her language or ‘mind style’, grammatical and stylistic idiosyncrasies as well as elliptical syntax. The above devices will be useful in staging figural narration in Byron’s poetry. Interior monologue will also be useful in the following analysis for quoting psychic processes in “The Corsair” which constructs fragments or texts in the likeness of stream of consciousness novels. All these techniques for staging thoughts –

Note should be taken however to avoid confusing the stream of consciousness device with interior monologue. The stream of consciousness is embedded in the interior monologue.


When debating the intriguing question of textual strategies that can create the impression of figural narration, the reader needs to be aware that although figural narration is treated here as one form for constructing a narrative situation and context meanings, most of the techniques used for its identification and construction of meaning are similar to those of focalisation since focalization is also one of the methods for rendering perception and consciousness in texts. One may also need to add that such devices as streams of consciousness, interior monologue, and particularly free indirect discourse (narrated monologue) which create the impression of a mixed form tends to blur their very distinctions, hence complicating the whole process of marking a category as distinctly different. That is not in any sense to imply that such ambiguous devices tend to lose their status as distinct from one another. Rather, it is important to see these forms as productive ways Byron allowed the reader to construct a narrative tradition from poetry.

Cohn (1978) notes too that interior monologues are more suitable for quoting the mind in stream of consciousness novels, but agrees that ‘silent soliloquy (thought quotation) is apt for quoting the mind in more traditional novels.
psyconarration (the narrator’s discourse about a character’s consciousness), free indirect discourse, and stream of consciousness or a character’s mental discourse (Cohn 1978: 14) - will be used below as evidence of manifestations of the figural mode in Byron’s narrative poems constructed in the third person\(^{245}\). A discussion of strategies that can be productive for staging figural narration logically leads to illustration. A good starting point for a discussion of the uses of figural narration in Byron’s poetry should be a review of works that have applied narrative theory to the texts chosen for analysis. After describibg “The Corsair” as a narrative verse in heroic couplets, Fischer (1982: 44, 51) draws attention to the following phrases from some of Byron’s narrative poems to support his argument that Byron’s dramatization of those lines in dialogue form has the effects of ‘giving them the semblance of an interior monologue of characters’: ‘Who thundering comes on blackest steed? / (“Giaour”), Whose voice is heard? whose carbine rang? / (“The Bride of Abydos” II) /, But where is he? / Oh! / And is he gone? (“The Corsair” I) /, And was she here? And is he now alone? /, And why had Lara cross’d the bounding main?’ (“Lara I”) / Could this mean peace? /, Why comes not Ezzelin’. The lines above reveal no traces of narratorial mediation and voice; rather, the impression one gets is a presentation of psychic processes or thoughts of a character. Nonetheless, Fischer says nothing about figural narration whose manner of textual manifestation suits the above analysis. Such an argument is intended to draw a line between the present study and extant literature applying narration to poems chosen for analysis.

The following passage from “The Corsair” (II: X) which describes Conrad’s introspections in a lonely prison provides an illustrative example of how the interior monologue and or stream of consciousness is used productively in analyzing Byron’s poetry to yield meaning:

```
Even in that lonely hour when most it feels,
And, to itself, all-all that self reveals,
No single passion, and no ruling thought
That leaves the rest at once unseen, unsought;
But the wild prospect when the soul reviews-
All rushing through their thousand avenues,
Ambition’s dream expiring, love’s regret,
```

\(^{245}\) Cf. Cohn’s (1978: 11) argument that the term ‘omniscience description’ or ‘internal analysis has been applied for thought representation techniques, but neither is satisfactory […] Omniscience is too general; anything, not only the psyche can be described omnisciently.’ Similarly, internal analysis is misleading because it does not allow for an understanding of the plain reportorial or highly imagistic ways of narrating consciousness. Cohn is right. The heterodiegetic narrator of “Lara” as would be seen, sometimes fuses his language with that of the protagonist Lara; as also in “The Corsair”, and hence warrants theoretical distinction. Even the definition of free indirect discourse as the fusion of the narrator’s and characters language may be misleading too since it would imply that the fictional psyche enters the text in the narrator’s language. Interior monologues shall be used for analysing quotation of thought in the character’s language.
Endangered glory, life itself beset;
The joy untasted, the contempt or hate
‘Gainst those who fain would triumph in our fate;
The hopeless past, the hasting future driven
Too quickly on to guess if hell or heaven;
Deeds, thoughts, and words, perhaps remember’d not
So keenly till that hour, but ne’er forgot;
Things light or lovely in their acted time,
But now to stern reflection each a crime;
The withering sense of evil unreveal’d,
Not cankering less because the more conceal’d-
All, in a word, from which all eyes must start,
That opening sepulchre—the naked heart
Bares with its buried woes, till Pride awake,
To snatch the mirror from the soul—and break.


This text contains a number of indications that reveal the dominance of the reflector mode. In fact, the text provides grounds for the reader to see Byron almost anticipating Virginia Woolf’s (1967 [1966]) ‘ordinary mind in an ordinary day’, receiving ‘myriads of impressions’ since what is emphasized is not physical actions but Conrad’s introspections. The first thing one notices is that the passage reveals no traces of a distinct narrator as it reproduces only reflections. The reader is likely to adopt the point of view of the story internal character as he/she sees and experiences events, a fact that may likely creates the impression of a focaliser. This claim also suggests that the poem contains narrative devices often associated with modern prose. In the passage quoted above, what is ostensible is the phenomenon of internal action and mental crisis often attributed to psychological characters (or the manifestations of the psyche of fictional characters in modern prose fiction). The narrative is largely interpreted from a figural point of view evident in the dream like portrayal of memories, introspections, and sensations, hence, projecting events predominantly and directly from the mind. In an earlier analysis, Elfenbein (1995: 21), though not concerned with a narratological analysis, acknowledges the passage’s engagement with the inner recesses of the mind. He describes it as the fantasy of a passage and concludes that the passage is a demonstration of the author’s (Byron) acquaintance with the workings of the heart. Elfenbein’s description is suitable because it points towards the modern concept of the mind as a source of literary material, which this chapter seeks to stage, with such categories as interior monologue and/or stream of consciousness in a bid to speak about the functions of the figural reflector in poetry analysis. One prominent indicator which is likely to create the initial impression that narration is controlled not by the external narrator, but is highly ‘mirrored in the consciousness of a
character, a reflector,\textsuperscript{246} (who, though not aware that he is the mediator of a story, serves as one) is the use of stream of consciousness device or interior monologue. The hypothetical claim that what is represented in the passage is a self, a mind in silent meditation and reflection can be corroborated by the frequent use of elliptical sentences or broken phrases and clichés that suggests that emphasis is on the introspections of the reflector- Conrad in a secluded cell. The passage begins with a mind brooding and musing on its predicament, loneliness, frustrated ambitions, and a past life that was characterized by hidden crimes. In fact, Conrad’s introspection is presented as if it were the interior of any psyche (Elfenbein 1995: 181). Since there is no narrator or mediator, it becomes clear that the mind is the focus of reflections. From every indication, it is not the narrator who speaks here. It is the third person reflector reproducing the crisis and impressions in his/her mind or psyche. Since the reader plunges directly into a fragmented and illogical mind, such a description suits our understanding of stream of consciousness. This kind of description is also similar to what Stanzel calls figural narrative situation. Undeniably, the text is dominated by the stream of consciousness device and therefore exemplifies the reflector mode. The mode of presentation is almost dreamlike. Although readers may be misled by the heterodiegetic narratorial voice at the beginning of the passage trying to reproduce Conrad’s impressions: ‘Twere vain to pain what his feelings grew’, what is emphasized is Conrad’s introspections since the heterodiegetic narrator withdraws completely after introducing Conrad as the internal character. Since emphasis is on the mind, and since the mind functions in fluxes, it is obvious that in order to represent this area, syntax should be loose, elliptical and distorted:

\begin{quote}
‘Even in that lonely hour when most it feels,
And, to itself, all-all that self reveals,
No single passion, and no ruling thought
That leaves the rest at once unseen, unsought;
But the wild prospect when the soul reviews-
[…]
All-all-before-beyond-the deadliest fall’
\end{quote}


Notice the complete absence of reference to the subject of the verbs. Further, there are no complete sentences, but phrases that are not well punctuated as revealed by the profusion of comas, colons, and pauses or sudden breaks in the middle of lines. Conrad is seen here grappling with illogical issues and reminiscences including ambitions, dreams, love’s regret, crime, glory, and the hopeless past all at the same time. The presentation is almost

\textsuperscript{246} de Jong (2001: 71).
cinematographic. What strikes the reader is the complete suppression of authorial voice since it is Conrad, the reflector, or center of consciousness (on the diegetic plane), thinking, brooding, and reviewing events in life. The thoughts come to his mind in flashes and illogically: ‘All rushing through their thousand avenues’. This seems to me wholly in keeping with the theoretical imperatives of the reflector mode that correspond so closely with the linguistic form of stream of consciousness narration.

The technique of stream of consciousness is also made evident in the above passage by means of haphazard associations. On this level, the interior monologue provides an aesthetic effect. What is apparent is the fact that the mind is converted into a setting, deploying imagery at times in place of inner speech; and thus becomes a sign that the technique of stream of consciousness transposes each thought into an image that expresses the thought itself. For example, the image of the ‘sepulchre’ (importing connotations of death) is here associated with the mind to suggest the blurred nature of the mind. This also suggests the mind’s imaginative ability of thinking in images. The ‘opening sepulchre’ – an image which transposes the mind into a grave which harbors everything including ‘buried woes’ brings in the metaphoric emphasis and suggests that it is the mind that is performing the activities of imagination, thinking, predicting, and introspecting. Such associations carry the self to a dream-like mode in time that seems to be flying, drawing near the ‘hastening future’ and provoking thoughts of heaven or hell. The mind or inner thought is thus converted into images and becomes a scene for metaphoric associations. Such subconscious associations of things through imagery can only be possible in the mind. The technique as such proves useful in describing thoughts and subconscious memories. Such a narrative analysis fit the mode of describing textual manifestations of fictional minds called stream of consciousness. Conrad’s mind, introspections, memories, retrospections and prospections are presented in a manner that clearly suggests a concern with psychic states. What the reader encounters is ‘a self exhibiting the characteristic features of a reflector – character: it does not narrate or address a listener or reader, but reflects in its consciousness its own momentary situation’ to borrow Cohn’s (1978: 100) words in a different context. What Cohn says in the context of narrative (prose) fiction is equally true of the above passage. What strikes the reader is the fact there is scarcely any form of interpersonal contacts in the form of dialogue or conversation that is typical of authorial narrative situation. In addition, personal pronouns, reader address devices or forms of external actions that may indicate the presence of a first-person or authorial
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247 Ralph Freedman, (1963: 218-219) reacting to a passage written in a similar manner.
(heterodiegetic) voices are absent. After the remark: ‘Twere vain to paint what his feelings grew-/It were even doubtful if their victim knew’, the authorial narrator completely withdraws leaving the reader to follow up events in the eyes of the figural character- Conrad. Since the emphasis is on Conrad’s (the reflector’s) introspections, the stream of consciousness device functions to reveal apparent shift from the external world to the self or mind in action. The technique of stream of consciousness thus makes the mind of Conrad accessible to poetry as a source of literary material.

Another striking characteristic related to the device of the stream of consciousness is the constant occurrence of half-finished and sometimes unpunctuated sentences, snatches of phrases, often remembered subjective experiences, scraps of past hidden secrets, and future projections: ‘Deeds, thoughts, and words, perhaps remember’d not / So keenly till that hour, but ne’er forgot.’ All of these allow the reader to have direct access to the thoughts flickering through the mind of Conrad. Since the mind is illusive and illogical, the language used to convey this area is that of the stream of consciousness marked by distorted syntax and phrases. This fluidity in the presentation of Conrad’s mind is also realized through the haphazard and simultaneous renderings of his present situation in prison with his past ‘all rushing through their thousand avenues’ at the same time. The concurrent description of the past, present, and future are conveyed in the following unpunctuated and illogical expressions: ‘that lonely hour’ / When the mind ‘feels’, the self reveals; and the ‘Soul reviews’, ambitious, dreams, love’s regret, the ‘hopeless past, ‘the hasting future’, and the secret crimes, and ‘evils unreveal’d’. Such a manner of narration is fluid, indirect and illogical in nature, and becomes an indicator of flashes or illogical flow of thoughts in Conrad’s restless mind. This faithful transcription of the mind through the stream of consciousness technique is synonymous with a cinematographic record of life pictures. The analogy between the stream of consciousness device and a film of moving pictures can be explained by the use of loose continuous sentences quoted above. In view of the above analysis, it is also apparent that time in poetry, just like in modern prose is not linear. Time like plot becomes fragmented and justifies why there is no direct story line in the text. All through the narrative text there is no illusion of narratorial mediation or dialogue. It is a mind communing with itself-an instance of the dramatic monologue and psychological conflict that had often been seen to characterize modern prose. The use of the devices of stream of consciousness and interior monologue constitute some ways of constructing figural narration in Byron’s poetry, and leave traces of the link that can be established between the said poetry and modern prose fiction.
As the poem increasingly conveys the impression of a mental setting or of the presence of a psychological character—a reflector, it has affinities with what Virginia Woolf (in the eyes of Randel Stevenson, 1996a: 443) calls ‘time in the mind’, rather than ‘time on the clock’, understood to mean the fluidity and illogicality in the presentation of events. The presentation of events evades any sense of a linear plot. This is suggested in the text by emphasis on Conrad’s haphazard memories and recollections. The notion that there is no plot is also evident in the literary associations of the present moments with events long distant from it in time, often culminating in stitching past experience into present consciousness.\(^{248}\) The past life and the future are fused with the present moment in Conrad’s recollections. The present tense is signaled by the use of ‘now’. By means of the technique of stream of consciousness, the passage is capable of relating events that did not occur on the scene of action and by so doing establishes a link among different parts of the text. This is evident in the hate and love dreams flashing in the mind of Conrad. Such a narrative manner fits our understanding of the stream of consciousness technique and eventually lets the reader see the possibility of structuring poetry, or even narrative, temporarily in the mind. In the light of functionality, the stream of consciousness renders the mind (and not the outer world) as a source of poetic material. Since the technique is capable of capturing or describing the fragmentariness, chaos, flashes, metaphoric transpositions, crises and the juxtapositions that often characterize the mind, it can be considered a productive intergeneric device for the construction of the figural narrative situation in Byron’s poetry.

It is evident from the above interpretation that the reflector, whose perceptions and introspections represented by stream of consciousness device, plays a central role in determining the identity of the agent the text constructs. When one compares the passage above with modern prose passage below:

```
It pained him that he did not know what politics meant and that he did not know where the universe ended. He felt small and weak. When will he be like the fellows in poetry and rhetoric?
```

and even another one in which Stephen Dedalus is thinking about vacations:

```
First came the vacation and the next term and then the vacation again and again another term and then another vacation. It was like a train in and out of tunnels and that was like the noise of boys eating in the refectory when you open and close the flaps of yours ears [...],
```

(Joyce 1973 [1916], *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.)

it is possible to discern internal focalization since it is the perceptions of the story internal characters that determine what is narrated. Based on the above evidence, one may wonder whether Byron did not foreground or anticipate Modernism since modern novels often construct reflector characters. His poetry no doubts can construct a context like the literary tradition typical of modern prose.

To demonstrate the hypothesis that Byron’s poetry provides narrative features for constructing figural narration, one needs to consider the following passage from “The Corsair” (about distorted or fragmentary feelings going on in Conrad’s mind as he waits for Gulnare in his lone cell) which combines the interior monologue and psychonnarration:

Meanwhile long, anxious, weary, still the same
Roll’d day and night: his soul could terror tame –
This fearful interval of doubt and dread,
When every hour might doom him worse than dead,
When every step that echo’d by the gate
Might entering lead where axe and stake await;
When every voice that grated on his ear
Might be the last that he could ever hear;
Could terror tame- that spirit stern and high
Had proved unwilling as unfit to die;
‘Twas worn-perhaps decay’d – yet silent bore
That conflict, deadlier far than all before:
The heat of fight, the hurry of the gale,
Leave scarce one thought inert enough to quail;
But bound and fix’d in fetter’d solitude,
To pine, the prey of every changing mood;
To gaze on thine own heart; and meditate
Irrevocable faults, and coming fate-
Too late the last to shun – the first to mend –
To count the hours that struggle to thine end,
With not a friend to animate, and tell
To other ears that death became thee well:
Around thee foes to forge the ready lie,
And blot life’s latest scene with calumny;
Before thee tortures, which the soul can dare,
Yet doubts how well the shrinking flesh may bear;
But deeply feels a single cry would shame,
To valour’s praise thy last and dearest claim;
The life thou leav’st below, denied above
By kind monopolists of heavenly love;
And more than doubtful paradise – thy heaven
Of earthly hope – thy loved one from thee riven.
Such were the thoughts that outlaw must sustain,
[...]


A passage like the one above is likely to provoke two or more fundamental readings. The question that is likely to be asked especially when one chooses to read the text as a figural mode is that of how thoughts or consciousness take over the role of telling. One may also
wish to find out where narrational omniscience (psychonarration) begins and ends, and where
the interior monologue features. The first striking thing about the text is that words or phrases
in the very first lines like ‘anxious’ ‘weary’, ‘still the same / Roll’d day and night; / his soul
would terror tame’ may appear to be the narrator’s report of the mental unrest in Conrad’s
mind (as he broods on his destiny in the lonely cell where he is imprisoned after
masterminding the attack that led to the burning of Seyd’s palace). This claim is supported by
the last line of the passage that reveals the presence of a covert authorial heterodiegetic
narrator attempting to reproduce Conrad’s thoughts: ‘such were the thoughts that outlaw must
sustain’. The reporting clause points not only towards the presence of the narrator; it also
suggests that the narrator knows what Conrad is thinking, and interprets it in his own
language. The narrator’s cognitive ability to know and reproduce a character’s state of mind
suggested in the statement that Conrad is thinking therefore gives the impression of
psychonarration, and or omniscience. One may argue that there are also traces of the interior
monologue and even free indirect discourse in the passage as the following analysis will
show.

The expressions: ‘his soul could terror tame / This fearful interval of doubt and dread / When
every hour might doom him worse than dead / When every step echo’d by the gate / Might
entering lead where axe and stake await / When every voice that grated on his ears / Might
be the last’, may create the impression of the reflections, introspections, anxiety, fears
and doubts going on in Conrad’s mind and not mediated. This suits our understanding of
interior monologue especially as there are no traces of a narrator and subject. Further reading
between the lines will suggest that the most prominent aspect of the narrative emphasized in
the text is interior monologue also known as quoted monologue. The line that begins: ‘This
fearful interval of doubt and dread’, and continues with expressions about the feelings of one
in solitude; and of torments caused by self-examination (‘To gaze on thine own heart’; and
meditate / irrevocable faults, and coming fate / a life lived by counting hours’ till the line ‘of
earthly hope- thy loved one from thee riven’) is narrated in a way that the impression
conveyed is that of one in deep reflections and meditation. The use of imagery has taken the
place of physical actions and appears also to have replaced the subject. The mental conflict in
Conrad’s mind is compared to death and is even said to be more fierce and dangerous than
wind and the rampaging fire incident that consumed Seyd’s palace: ‘That conflict, deadlier
than all before/The heat of fight, the hurry of the gale’. The setting is still the mind. This
description calls attention to what Nüning/Nüning (2004: 125) describe as ‘a highly
mimetic form of presenting consciousnesses. Notice the absence of any form of self-reference

from the passage above hence denying the reader any possibility of gauging an identifiable speaker or perceiver of events. Of importance is the fact that only feelings of Conrad are quoted, and this is an unmistakable indicator that what the reader encounters is a ‘self that already exhibits the characteristic feature of a reflector character’, a self that neither narrates nor ‘addresses a listener or reader’, but reflects on its consciousness its own momentary situation.\(^{249}\) Such a strategy is apt to construct a figural narrative situation.

Another important indicator that the passage constructs a self distinct from the narrator’s mediating voice, and which is important for marking the text as an interior monologue is the use of the present tense. The second part of the text that features basically the conflict in Conrad’s mind is presented in the present tense, evident in words like ‘gaze’, ‘coming fate’, ‘mend’, ‘animate’, ‘forge’, can dare’, ‘feels’, ‘shame’, leav’st and probably more. Since the interior monologue directs the readers’ attention to the psychic processes and conflict in Conrad’s mind, what is equally noticed is the absence of any reference to time, setting, and the external world. Even references to the fight, wind, solitude, a life of pining, and the feelings of being tormented by thoughts and moods of impending death and so on are filtered through the subjective perspective of Conrad to adopt the expressions of Nünning/Nünning (2004: 126). Equally of importance is the total absence of ‘thematic coherence’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 126). What one finds is a series of distorted ideas, opinions, conflicts, and fears in Conrad’s mind in flashes. Both the loose syntax and thematic incoherence are also a representation of Conrad’s mind at the moment of imprisonment, and probably approximates the stream of consciousness technique. The above analysis reveals a further way Byrond’s poetry can construct a narrative situation in the third person reflector mode.

The interior monologue has important functions that deserve attention here. First, it represents the mind as a source of setting, and of literary information and hence offers the reader a possibility to see how the mind works or enters literature. The various distinguishing markers of the interior monologue are crucial in determining the kind of narrative situation a text constructs (probably a figural one); and also the extent to which the reader construes events, time and setting as elements of the psychic processes. The content of the interior monologue also grants the reader an insight into Conradd’s subjective feelings and judgements and becomes in itself a means of characterizing that character, as well as

\(^{249}\) For the use of the phrase in a similar context, see Cohn’s *The Distinction of Fiction* (1999: 100).
constructing him as a psychological character, at least, to an extent. Another advantage such a device features is that it becomes a genre marker – in this case, it leads to such understanding that there exists a narrative type of poetry, specifically one that bears affinities with modern prose’s emphasis on psychological characters. Such an interpretation is likely to dismiss traditional illusions that poetry has the sole agenda of semantisizing, musicalising and versification. On the whole, the markers of interior monologue exist as a transgeneric link between the poetry under study and narrative fiction.

Free indirect discourse can be an important analytical tool and therefore a significant factor in assessing functions of the figural mode in the analysis of Byron’s poetry. Narrative evidence for staging thoughts and reflections is contained in a passage from “The Corsair” (III: X) about Gulnare’s murder of the Seyd and Conrad’s reaction to it -what he considers unconventional and thus homicide:

He had seen battle-he had brooded lone
O’er promised pangs to sentenced guilt foreshown;
He had been tempted, chasten’d and the chain
Yet on his arms might ever there remain:
But ne’er from strife, captivity, remorse-
From all his feelings in their inmost force –
So thrill’d so shuddered every creeping vein,
As now they froze before that purple stain.
That spot of blood, that light but guilty streak,
Had banish’d all the beauty from her cheek!
Blood he had view’d could view unmoved-but then
It flow’d in combat, or was shed by men!


The passage above about Conrad’s thoughts provides grounds for staging the fruitfulness of the technique of free indirect discourse in the analysis of “The Corsair”. The passage is an account of ‘Gulnare’s vindictive murder of the Seyd’ (Marshall 1962: 52) and Conrad’s reflectorial reaction to it. Once again, the representation of the internal processes, impressions, reflections or thoughts of Conrad is central to narration. The setting is in the mind of Conrad as suggested by content matter. What is reproduced is the mind or perceptions of Conrad rendering his dissent for homicide (and not the narrator recounting his thoughts) especially when the murderer is a woman: ‘Blood he had view’d, could view unmoved-but then/ It flow’d in combat, or was shed by men!’ Conrad is in a lonely cell, brooding and talking to himself; hence it is no mistake that the text is constructed in the form of a narrated monologue. The third-person pronoun ‘he’ and the use of past tense signals such as ‘had seen’, ‘broodened’, ‘tempted’, ‘chasten’d’, ‘shuddered’, ‘banish’d’, ‘view’d’, and ‘shed’ are further clues of direct access to the thoughts of the story internal character. Conrad
thinks that battle, brutality, murder and violence of temperament are male attributes. Consequently, he considers homicidal tendencies as male attributes otherwise it would be considered repulsive and unconventional when carried out by a woman. Since it is inner language (that of the character Conrad) that is staged, and not pure narration, the narrated monologue is suggested by attitudes of contempt. Hence one finds Conrad disagreeing in his mind to certain values. Additionally, a verb of perception such as ‘brooded’ indicates the reflector’s mind as a center of orientation. Further, a deictic of place such as ‘now’ puts the reflector in the psychic event, and ‘gives the reader the impression of following’ the events through the eyes or perspective of the character – Conrad. Of importance is the fact that narration above is thematized in gender issues and this is also one way Byron’s poetry may create contexts or an ideology like feminism.

A similar example in which purely narrative sentences appear to be Conrad’s thoughts in his own language rather than the narrator’s report about internal processes occurs in a passage describing the sudden thoughts plunging into Conrad’s mind on his journey to the battle front:

Alas! those eyes beheld his lucky tower,
And live a moment o’er the parting hour;
She – his Medora-did she mark the prow?
Ah! never loved he half so much as now!


The first two sentences might be read as narratorial report. But it would be erroneous to see the last two sentences in the same light because the language in the lines appear to be that of Conrad in a sudden moment of remembrance of Medora during the ‘parting hour’. The presence of rhetorical questions or colloquial style in the phrases: ‘she - his Medora - did she mark the prow? / Ah! never loved he so much as now’ are indications that Conrad is reflecting in his thoughts, and also constitutes characteristic parameters for identifying and analysing a free indirect discourse text. A further parameter indicating the use of free indirect discourse is the past tense device in words like ‘beheld’, ‘did’, and ‘loved’. The devices such as the past tense, rhetorical questions and ellipsis are suited to mark the passage above as free indirect discourse, and consequently, construct a figural narrative situation.

Furthermore, the preceding sentence which describes Conrad’s emotions and reactions when Gulnare returns from the palace: ‘tis she at last! No poniard in that hand-nor sign of ill-
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250 See Nünning/Nünning (2004: 114) for the account of the reflector mode and its textual manifestation.
Thanks to that softening heart—she could not kill’, (“The Corsair”, III: IX) is written in a way that reveals no traces of authorial intrusion, but a display of Conrad’s thoughts in his own language. What the reader finds is thought stream in the mind of Conrad. Again, the subsequent sentences: ‘He had seen battle—he had brooded lone, / O’er pangs to sentenced guilt foreshown’, (“The Corsair”, III: X) appear not to be the author’s reproduction of Conrad’s thoughts; it is rather the train of thought in Conrad’s mind that is emphasized using past tense devices like ‘had seen’ and ‘had brooded’. The thoughts devices orientate narration and suggest that Conrad is a character in the story. Granted that it is Conrad who has witnessed men fighting in battle, and not the narrator, it is logical that reflections about battle and murder which are here equated with male activities should originate in the mind of Conrad. This explanation is backed by the fact that it is Conrad who acknowledges having ‘seen’ battle. Given that Conrad is imprisoned in a lonely cell, it is likely that the verbs ‘seen’ and ‘brooded’ originated in his mind as part of his perceptual and psychic activities or thoughts. In addition, past tense and other contextual references that trace reflections, feelings, memories and thought trend to Conrad are particularly significant for the reader’s understanding of the narrated monologue and its manifestations in the passage above. Evidence supporting this claim is found in the frequency with which the past tense occurs in narrated monologue sentences: ‘He had seen battle—he had brooded lone / He had been tempted, chasten’d / Blood he had viewed […] but then / It flowed in combat, or was shed by men!’ (“The Corsair”, III: X). The profusion of past tense references in ‘had’, ‘tempted’; and the particular phrase that reads: ‘He had seen battle’ contains a third-person reference to whom action-words like ‘seen’, ‘brooded’, ’tempted’, ‘chasten’d’, and ‘viewed’ are attributed. The plot oriented perceptual words contain a third person reference ‘He’ and consequently put Conrad in the story as the centre of consciousness. The explanation suggests that the point of view from which a reader sees things is that of the reflector, Conrad, and not the narrator’s. Again, since it is Conrad who is on the scene of action with Gulnare who has committed murder, and given that it is Conrad who has seen Gulnare’s blood-stained fingers, it is logical to attribute the opinion that homicide is unconventional and a criminal act when masterminded by a woman (‘That spot of blood that light but guilty streak’) to Conrad. Based on evidence that the story-internal character (Conrad) is the one who saw the action and passes his personal judgement, one would assume that the impression created that ‘That spot of blood’ bespeaks the murderer’s (Gulnare’s) guilt, and has ‘tarnished all the beauty from her cheek’ constitutes his inward thoughts and opinion. Conrad even admits that when he saw Gulnare’s blood-stained fingers, he was overwhelmed by fear: ‘his feelings in their inmost
force-/ thrill’d’ and even all his veins ‘shuddered’ (“The Corsair”, III: X). In the further lines, the use of the deictic adverb ‘and now’ also contributes to suggest that the viewing or perceptual activity conveyed in ‘feelings’ and the emotions of fright suggested in ‘thrill’d’ are associated with emotional states of mind of Conrad. Such a manner of narration approximates what is called free indirect discourse. In addition, the contextual clues reporting Conrad’s past loneliness and the opinion that murder is an activity forbidden to the female sex allow the reader to see the passage as a projection of Conrad’s point of view. Psychic and emotional states conveyed in ‘seen’ ‘brooded’, ‘feelings in their inmost force - / So thrilled, so shudder’d’, ‘froze’ and ‘viewed’ reveal the use of free indirect discourse in further ways. The devices structure Conrad’s narration around frames of emotions, feelings, thinking, viewing or even experiencing […] rather than telling,251 as they grant direct access into the ‘sensory impressions and consciousness’ (cf. Fludernik 1996: 170) of Conrad who is silently castigating female participation in murder or crime. It may be argued that a verb of perception like ‘seen’ or experiencing like ‘brooded’, and even that pertaining to emotions like ‘shuddered’ make free indirect discourse yield more towards activities of introspection than narration. ‘Seen’ and ‘brood’ may be considered visual and thought acts, and serve as different forms of internal activities. Such a narrative strategy gives the passage a figural force and reveals one way Byron’s poetry constructs narration similar to that cherished in modern prose fiction. Since the action verbs are those that describe the thought-act performed by the reflector – Conrad, who appears to be talking to himself; they are all verbs of psychological perception and introspection. Based on the textual and contextual clues analyzed above, one can therefore suppose that the sentences in the narrated monologue do not construct the narrator’s narration, but Conrad’s reflections and point of view regarding Gulnare’s vindictive murder of her husband. The above clues for free indirect discourse mode can function as producers of thought or mental activities. Both the past tense and the third person references in ‘he’ and ‘Conrad’ are useful in drawing a transition or temporal distance between introspection or reflections and mediation. Past tense, thought trend, and contextual clues have therefore become some crucial considerations for transgeneric narratology and can mark off narrated monologue from authorial (heterodiegetic) discourse, and consequently constitute a fertile ground for staging figural narration in Byron’s poetry.

251 Nünning/Nünning, (2004: 144), Also see Fludernik (1996: 170), for a similar argument that the linguistic forms of reflector mode narration are viewing and experiencing frames, and allow for an understanding of the story through the eyes of fictional consciousness.
Notice that the mind of Conrad is quoted by someone on the discourse level on whom a higher authority is conferred, called omniscience. This external agent is indisputably the narrator guiding the reader to have immediate and temporary access into what is going on in the mind of Conrad. Such is the work of free indirect discourse too. In that sense, free indirect discourse performs the further important task of identifying the speakers and their roles in a narrative communication act. In the words of Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 113), the technique goes beyond mere identification of speakers ‘to assigning specific speech features or attitudes to them’. The technique can thus guide the reader to attribute point of view to the right textual agent.

Another example for illustrating the extent to which the use of past tense device, consciousness representation categories, and personal pronouns in the third-person can function as relevant markers of free indirect discourse for representing the figural narration and its functions in Byron’s poetry occurs in another passage about Conrad’s reactions to the murder act committed by Gulnare: ‘Again he look’d / Her hurrying hand had left ’twas but a spot - / It’s hue was all he saw, and scarce withstood – / Oh! slight but certain pledge of crime – ’tis blood!’ (“The Corsair”, III: IX). This is the free indirect discourse representation of thoughts of a reflector character-Conrad. The narrator’s report of the reflector’s mental activity of perception introduces the reflector in the third-person reference viewing the blood stain on Gulnare’s finger. Apart from the fact that the reflector is the one performing the action of watching the scene, the perceptual activity of seeing conveyed in the line ‘he saw’ is attributed to him. The exclamation mark in ‘Oh!’ and moralizing voice equating the act of blood shed with criminality: ‘Oh! Slight but certain pledge of crime – ’tis blood!’ identifies the perceiver or viewer (Conrad) and his attitude towards murder, and also marks off the discourse fragment spoken by the authorial narrator (on the heterodiegetic level of the text) from the character’s narrated monologue. The third-person reference ‘he’ is repeated several times and refers to the reflector (Conrad) and also suggests that he is the one from whom thought reflections and opinions about murder (homicide) and criminality have their origin. The crucial distinction between the authorial narrator and reflector character are rendered obvious by means of exclamation marks: ‘Oh! Slight but certain pledge of crime – ’tis blood!’, the third-person reference (‘he’), and past tense device ‘saw’. The presence of the third person reference ‘he’, the past tense references, the rhetorical questions and exclamation mark (Oh!) constitute hallmark marks of free indirect discourse. There is also a sense in which the reader sees the discourse as combinatory and therefore embedded. One may argue that the voice that attributes the individuality of pronominal references ‘he’ to the internal character is
the authorial heterodiegetic narrator on the external level of the story although the reflection is
done by the reflector - Conrad himself. In that case, the character’s mental activities or
psychic processes are introduced by the narrator who knows what is going on in the
character’s mind. The difficulty in attribution perspective reflects the complexity of the
technique of free indirect discourse itself, since such a narration that begins with a narratorial
report and then blends with thoughts and reflections suggests that the external narrator had
seen what Conrad perceives and attempts to recount the story from the point of view of the
story internal character. One may therefore argue that sentences like ‘He had seen battle – he
had brooded lone / He had been tempted / Blood he had viewed’ can also indicate the
narrator’s account of Conrad’s thought processes without the use of thought indicators. If
linguistically speaking, the narrator sees and recounts (indirectly) what Conrad perceives with
the same viewing frames of seeing, then there must be free indirect discourse which still
introduces the aspect of complexity. That is however true to an extent. When one takes a
curious look at the originator of the perception in the narrating sentence: ‘Its hue was all he
saw’, one cannot fail to notice that the narrator has stepped out and thus assign thoughts and
perceptions to the diegetic character-Conrad. It is clear that a verb of perception like ‘saw’
reflects Conrad’s experiencing and perceptual activities and not just narratorial report. A
closer reading of the following passage with an eye on techniques of conveying Conrad’s
thoughts, perceptions and also attitude toward murder may strengthen my claim that they
reveal the identity of the speaker as a figural character. The same observation may perhaps
sustain my view that figural narrative situation can be a useful intergeneric category for
identifying, marking and making distinctions between reflector modes and other narrating
agents (in poetic analysis) as another central function.

The passage from “Lara” which starts in a typical omniscience authorial style with the
narrator reporting about Lara’s (Pocock, 1948: 277-278, vol 2) recovery from trance provides
an illustrative example of how free indirect discourse can be useful in constructing figural
narration hardly emphasized in Byron’s narrative poetry by early critics:

Vain thought! That hour of ne’er unravell’d gloom
Came not again, or Lara could assume
A seeming of forgetfulness, that made
His vassals more amazed nor less afraid.
[…] Was it a dream? was his voice the voice that spoke
Those strange wild accents; his the cry that broke
Their slumber? his the oppress’d, o’er labour’d heart,
That ceased to beat, the look that made them start?
Could he who thus had suffer’d so forget,
When such as saw that suffering shudder yet?
The reader is invited to note that the momentary appearance of the narrative voice reporting from an external position is marked by the reportorial sentence ‘Lara could assume / A seeming of forgetfulness that made / His vassals more amazed nor less afraid’. This is immediately followed by the introduction of free indirect discourse by means of rhetorical questions and question mark: ‘was it a dream? was his the voice that spoke / Those strange wild accents; his the cry that broke / Their slumber?’ When one considers that the sentences contain past tense references in ‘was’, and ‘spoke’ the impression created is that of immediate access into the thoughts of Lara. In addition to the fact that thoughts are quoted in the past tense of narration, Lara’s agitation is rendered in his own language. It is his thoughts that are central to narration. Notice also the use of pronouns in the third person, which suggest that the focus is on the story-internal character. In the text, Lara assumes the position of the reflector. Through his/her musings, the reader has immediate access to the mind. The reader is not told about Lara’s involvement in any physical action, only his thoughts about his convulsive dream are recounted. The lines ‘was it a dream? / his the oppressed, O’er labour’d heart / That ceased to beat’ suggest that it is the reflector’s mental reflections about the dream event that is emphasized and hence can mark the text as free indirect discourse. Since the character’s mental condition is understood in terms of internal rather than external processes, the interdependence between free indirect discourse and interior monologue clarifies Franz Stanzel’s analysis of interior monologue:

In the Interior monologue the reader encounter a self that already exhibits the characteristic features of a reflector character. It does not narrate or address a listener or reader, but reflects indirect consciousness its own momentary situation. 252

There is still another possible interpretation to the above passage, when viewed in the light of psychonarration. The passage begins with an interjection ‘vain thought!’ That hour of ne’er unravell’d gloom / Came not again, or Lara could assume / A seeing of forgetfulness?’ The question of who the originator of these words is begs an answer. It is not Lara but the omniscient (authorial) narrator whose unrestricted privilege of knowledge permits him to see into Lara’s mind and interpret it. Lara’s thoughts are subordinated to the primary discourse. There appear to be a blurring of the identity of narratorial voice. The sentences: ‘Was it a dream? Was his the voice that spoke?’ do not reveal the identity of the speaker. It can only be

inferred. One can argue that hints for the third person-person pronoun marker feature some traces of the narrating voice or overt omniscience heterodiegetic speaker in the context of free indirect discourse text. Free indirect discourse has further functions. While through the technique, the reader understands ways of representing complexity in case of ‘bivocality’ or ‘polyvocality’ of perspective, it also signals ambiguity, the problematic relationship between any utterance and its origins (Rimmon Kenan 1983: 113). Both devices become functional in the analysis of complex or ambiguous levels of voice and thoughts in poetry. While it can be inferred that the narrated monologue plays the role of rendering the mind as a source of poetic material, and calls to mind the romantic and modern fiction’s tradition of making the mind a source of literary material, the very technique of free indirect discourse generally accredited to the figural mode opens up other ways one can construct narration or a narrative situation in poetry. Still by way of function, the reader is made to see the relationship, as well as the degree and kind of distance that separate the third person reflector from the omniscience (authorial discourse).

Another way psychonarration (which shades again to free indirect discourse) can be useful as an interpretive and analytical strategy in reproducing the figural model in Byron’s poetic texts is by analyzing a passage from “The Corsair” which describes Conrad’s fantasies and feelings as he waits relentlessly in his lonely prison for Gulnare:

The first day pass’d – he saw not her – Gulnare –
The second-third-and still she came not there;
But what her words avouch’d, her charms had done,
Or else he had not seen another sun.
The fourth day roll’d along, and with the night
Came storm and darkness in their mingling might:
Oh! How he listen’d to the rushing deep,
That ne’er till now so broke upon his sleep:
And his wild spirit wilder wishes sent,
Roused by the roar of his own element!
Oft had he ridden on that winged wave,
And loved its roughness for the speed it gave;
And now its dashing echo’d on his ear,
A long known voice – alas! too vainly near!
Loud sung the wind above; and, doubly loud,
Shook o’er his turret cell the thunder – cloud;
And flash’d the lightening by the latticed bar,
To him more genial than the midnight star:
Close to the glimmering gate he dragg’d his chain,
And hoped that peril might not prove in vain.


Readers may wonder whose fantasies are conveyed in the passage by means of perceptual forms and psychoanalogies. The linguistic aspects of the text which include personal pronouns in the third person (‘he’), the past tense construction as well as thought forms rang it
among what Stanzel (1971) calls the figural mode. Rendered in many narrative parameters including psychonarration and internal focalization, the poem constructs a reflector, which in itself distinguishes the story level from the superordinate heterodiegetic level on the discourse plane. The poem creates a psychic effect through the reflector character, Conrad, who is the center of consciousness. We are presented with a character-Conrad listening to waves, perceiving some wind or water which he compares to an aeroplane “winged wave” in terms of speed, and which he perceives as rough. This is an activity of imagination. The reader is made to understand that the psychoanalogy attributing wings to the wind or waves to emphasize its speed is the result of Conrad’s imagination, given that he is the one performing the perceptual or psychic activity of listening ‘to the rushing deep’. As a result of imagination, his ‘wild spirit wilder wishes’ reawakens him from spiritual sterility to a state of imaginative exuberance and awareness as he fantasies himself riding on the ‘winged wave’. It is Conrad’s perceptions and also imagination that is narrated (not his speech that the reader hears). Since the perceptions that orientate the story are those of Conrad, he is thus an internal focalizer. The third person individualizing pronoun ‘he’ refers to Conrad inside the story and not the heterodiegetic narrator. In addition, the auditory and perceptual verbs such as ‘he listen’d’ and ‘his […] wishes sent’ are perceptual verbs attributed to the agent inside the story and suggest that it is this agent who is listening, and imagining a lovely transcendental ride he had made on ‘the winged wave’ which ‘broke upon his sleep’. When the wind (‘roar of that element) awakens him from sleep, he realizes that the ‘winged wave’ that has set his mind imagining, day dreaming, and that has ‘echo’d in his ear’ is a long known voice—’the voice of Gulnare. Of importance is the fact that the wind or also water image (‘rushing deep’) is capable of rejuvenating his spirits by endowing him with imaginative potentials. The psychic activity of imagination is seen here to have a rejuvenating effect on Conrad’s mind. It is this same focalizer who is ‘Roused by the roar of his own element!’ and as he dreams of some pleasurable imaginative flights on the ‘winged wave’. This manner of narration by which imagination is central may suggests that Conrad is the perceiver of the wind in the image of an aeroplane. The reader is therefore made to see or perceive things in the way Conrad perceives them. The point of view is thus that of Conrad. By relying on clues to free indirect discourse including psychoanalogies, the reader can interpret the above passage as a projection of Conrad’s subjective feelings, fantasies, thoughts and imagination since it is not possible to take a ride on a wave. The mental setting introduces a relationship between inner life and the text. The verb ‘listen’d’ or noun ‘wishes’ which constitute a manifestation of Conrad’s perceptions and desires are suited to convey the impression of a reflector and to
construct the narrative situation as figural since it is Conrad’s wishes, feelings and thoughts that are narrated (as he sits lonely in his prison cell waiting for Gulnare’s return).

More so, on the contextual plane, the prison setting in which Conrad is lonely, speculating on Gulnare’s return is a perfect environment and moment for meditation. There is no doubt that his reflections on the elements of nature make it imaginatively possible to assume a transcendental flight with the aid of imagination and psychoanalogies. The impression created is that of a figural mind, in deep fantasies and thoughts. Since the section preceding this passage is also embedded in thoughts sequence, ‘Such were the thoughts that outlaw must sustain’ (“The Corsair”, III; VI), there is no doubt that the information we get in the passage above originate in the mind of Conrad. Byron’s use of the technique of free indirect discourse points towards Fludernik’s concept of internal focalization proposed as a suitable strategy for representing the textual mind. In fact, the internal narrating agent in “Lara” as in “The Corsair” has affinities with the reflector mode in Woolf’s (1928) reflector character like Mrs Ramsay whose thoughts, sensations and memories are central to narration. Such is another way of making the narrated monologue productive in poetry discussion as it provides narrative grounds for the construction of figural narration.

Moreover, a curious reader can arguably categorize the text as embedded focalization. Let’s turn to the question of who is the originator of the words ‘oh! How he listened to the rushing deep’ or ‘And now its echo’d on his ears’. The interjection: ‘oh! how he listened to the rushing deep’ reveals the authorial narrator’s omniscience unlimited potential and authority of access in to the mind of Conrad. Since listening is a psychic activity, one wonders whose voice is it that knows and reports that a character in the story is listening to the passing wind. The authorial narrator is a covert depersonalized speaker on the discourse plane and this gives him the privilege of cognition and insight into other textual minds, hence he can follow Conrad where there is action, not only in prison, but in his mind. Even though the verbs ‘listen’d,’ ‘wish’d’, and ‘sent’ give perception to the intradiegetic character Conrad, it is the heterodiegetic narrator and not Conrad interpreting the workings of Conrad’s mind. By means of psychic verbs, ‘listen’d’ and ‘wishes’, one can argue that although narration appears to be rendered from a point of view inside the story, the narrator who has been momentarily silent knows and reports about Conrad’s thoughts. The technique as such guides the reader to see not only the level where authorial and figural narrative situations meet, but also to see the possibility of structuring narration in the mind of the character in the story. It is useful in
analyzing complex levels of mediation in a poetic text i.e. when the heterodiegetic (authorial voice) who has controlled the narrative until the deictic ‘now’ introduces a transition.

After Gulnare’s departure, the narrator takes the reader again into Conrad’s mind by means of the device of narrated monologue and transitional markers. The device begins after the narrator’s report that Gulnare ‘press’d his (Conrad’s) fett’d fingers to her heart’, ‘bow’d her head, and turned to depart:

She press’d his fetter’d fingers to her heart,
And bow’d her head, and turn’d her to depart,
And noiseless as a lovely dream is gone,
And was she here? and is he now alone?
What gem hath dropp’d and sparkles o’er his chain?
The tear most sacred, shed for others’ pain,
That starts at once-bright-pure-from Pity’s mine
Already polish’d by the hand divine!
Oh ! too convincing – dangerously dear-


Relying on rhetorical questions, past tense, and linguistic devices in the above passage, it can be safe to say that free indirect discourse device has explicative functions, specifically if one begins the analysis by finding out the events that led to the present situation. The first thing to note about the passage is that it constructs the thoughts of Conrad through the narrated monologue device of rhetorical questions: ‘And was she here? And is he now alone?’ The impression that the text is a quotation of Conrad’s mind or reflections is again supported by contextual evidence stating that Gulnare has gone and the reflector (Conrad) is ‘now’ alone. Secondly, the use of the past tense ‘was’ and personal pronoun in the third person ‘he’ are further markers of narrated monologue that the passage contains. Gulnare has cried and left some tear drops on Conrad’s chain, an action Conrad interprets as the ability to feel for others in pain. Such an impression makes Conrad to discard immediately his earlier feelings about Gulnare. Her tears are perceived as having the value of a ‘gem’ This is a psychoanalogy associating the tear drops to something precious, ‘sacred’ and ‘divine’. This is justified by the fact that Conrad, the agent performing the mental activity of imagination implicitly recollects that Christ did a similar thing for humanity: ‘The tear most sacred, shed for other’s pain / Already polish’d by the hand divine!’ The psychoanalogy here is very important in explaining other forms and functions of free indirect discourse device in poetry interpretation. The attribution of ‘gem’, or ‘tears’ or even ‘holiness’, ‘purity’ to sacrificial and divine actions recalls Christ who died for others and is often remembered in the same attributes with which Gulnare is imaged. She is, in Conrad’s mind epitomized in the attributes of sanctity, purity and divinity. This is the work of imagination especially when an individual is endowed with
divine attributes by means of imagery. Even the impression that Gulnare is convincing and ‘dear’, but dangerous (which suggests her complex character), again originates in Conrad’s mind (and attributes point of view to him) because he is the one interpreting Gulnare’s actions. Exclamations also serve to suggest the attributes of free indirect discourse. Conrad can be said to be thinking in images, (or psychoanalologies), and in allusions which in themselves become strategies by which the narrator sets his narration temporally in the mind of the story internal character. Strategies of psychoanalogy are particularly significant not only in directing attention to the way the mind works, but also in making the very mind the source of poetic and narrative material. One also finds various useful ways of transforming the phenomenon of introspections, memories, fantasies, dreams and imaginations into poetic setting, poetic material and most importantly narrative material. One needs to add that the devices also contribute in raising and answering the questions of what narratological theories of consciousness representation can do for the interpretation of the poetry under study.

The passage where Gulnare is apparently moved by Corsair’s charms provides further illustration of the manifestation and also uses of free indirect discourse in poetry:

She gazed in wonder, ‘Can he calmly sleep, 
While other eyes his fall or ravage weep? 
And mine in restlessness are wandering here- 
What sudden spell hath made this man so dear? 
True- ’tis to him my life, and more, I owe, 
And me and mine he spared from worse than woe: 
’Tis late to think- but soft-his slumber breaks- 
How heavily he sighs!-he starts-awakes! ’


From the initial sentence, the narrator uses the psychic verb ‘wonder’ as an important clue to set the preceeding thought trend in Gulnare’s mind. ‘Wonder’ implies a feeling of surprise or bewilderment. Since the act of feeling itself is a mental activity, the verb automatically locates both setting and action in Gulnare’s mind and suggests the she is a character inside the story causing the psychic events that orientate the plot. Since Gulnare is the one watching Conrad in surprise, it is logical that the accompanying questions: ‘Can he calmly sleep, / While other eyes his fall or ravage weep? / And mine in restlessness are wandering here - / What sudden spell hath made this man so dear? ’ originate from Gulnare and constitute a projection of her perceptions and opinions in her own language. The signals for free indirect discourse in the above lines are quotation signs and question marks. The switch in narration from third-person references ‘She’ to first-person forms as ‘me’ introduces a switch in voice from authorial narratorial report (‘She gazed in wonder’) to reflectorial mode (‘Can he calmly sleep’/What
sudden spell hath made this man so dear?), and consequently a switch in point of view through the technique of free indirect discourse. Since the questions originate in Gulnare’s mind, the point of view is hers. The profusion of question marks adds to this effect. Narration in the above lines is not mediated (as may be suggested by the first line which occurs in form of mental report) since Gulnare’s thoughts have taken over telling. The impression conveyed is that the authorial narrator has temporarily receded to the background. Contextual clues supply further evidence that it is the thoughts of Gulnare and not narratorial report that are dramatized. Motivated by the instinct of sexual passion, Gulnare professes her obsession and sexual attraction for Conrad: ‘What sudden spell hath made this man so dear? / True – ’tis to him my life, and more, I owe’. Still in the above passage, references to ‘me’, ‘mine’, to passionate feelings and to the fact that Conrad spared Gulnare’s life (recalls the fire incident in Seyd’s palace when Conrad saved Gulnare from death), and therefore put Gulnare as the center of action, participating not as narrator, but as thinker and reflector. These thoughts which she acknowledges ‘Tis late to think-’, constitute the story, at least. What is also particularly important about the above passage is that it reveals unrestricted cognitive omniscience of the heterodiegetic narrator since he is able to read into Gulnare’s mind, and interpret her feelings, needs and impressions as she gazes at the one she passionately loves. The passage also characterises Gulnare as seductive as a functional effect. Of importance and in line with my hypothesis is the fact that free indirect discourse provides ways of constructing a reflector mode narrative situation in Byron’s poetry.

One strategy that signals a given text as psychonarration and which is important for analyzing Byron’s poems narrated in the third–person is what Palmer (2000) describes as mental and extra-mental forms of narrating consciousness. Both the mental and the extra-mental forms combine to account for some ways by which the authorial narrator in the third person follows characters everywhere there is action (both physical and psychic), enters their minds, and provides information relating to internal processes in general (in his own language). The claim that the authorial narrator is the interpreter of the events in “Don Juan” can be accounted for by relying on the technique of psychonarration. Psycho-narration is very evident in the narrating passages reporting the return of Lambro, the sea pirate:

Lambro, our sea-solicitor, who had
Much less experience of dry land than ocean,
On seeing his own chimney-smoke, felt glad,
But not knowing metaphysics, had no notion
Of the true reason of his not being sad,
Or that of any other strong emotion;
He loved his child, and would have wept the loss of her,
But knew the cause no more than a philosopher.
The above narrative text is an example of authorial narration about Lambro’s thoughts using the technique of psycho narration. Evidence of psychonarration is traced in mental vocabulary that suggests states of mind in action. In the sentences: ‘Lambro […] felt glad’, and ‘he loved’ his child, what is emphasized is Lambro’s state of mind, or silent feelings and emotions of joy or happiness. The text gives further references as evidence of the internal processes as well as the mind in thoughts. Lambro’s emotions, feelings and anxieties are reported in mental vocabulary: ‘surprised’, and ‘doubt’. ‘Surprised’ and ‘doubt’ are different states of feelings and mind and thus states that suggest a mind in psychic action. We are further told that Lambro perceives her daughter in the company of Juan as well as the dance animating ceremony with a feeling of ‘aversion’, and dread: ‘But Lambro saw all these things with aversion, / Perceiving in his absence such expenses, / Dreading that climax of all human ills, / The inflammation of his weekly bills’, (“Don Juan”, III:XXXV). Both ‘aversion’ and ‘dread’ are states of feelings and would suggest an attitude of dislike or repulsiveness. While the very words picture Lambro’s disturbed and disgruntled state of mind, they further convey his attitude towards the lovers as that of scorn probably towards Lambro.

In a further narratorial report, the reader is told that Lambro’s emotions are characterized by ‘love’ for many; and ‘fear for some’ (“Don Juan” III; XXI) hence, quoting Lambro’s state of mind, his emotions of fear, and also his feelings at the time of experience. The emotional verbs are ways by which the narrator quotes and interprets Lambro’s thoughts and mind. The profusion of psychic verbs and adjectives like ‘felt glad’, ‘loved’, ‘surprised’, ‘doubt’, and aversion’, lead the reader to know what Lambro’s feelings, thoughts, state of mind or emotional reactions are when he sees his beloved daughter gives in to a stranger. Such psychic actions implied in ‘aversion’ and ‘dreading’ are suited to convey Lambro’s state of mind or emotions apparently one of anger and disgust. The impression created is also that of rendering a disturbed state of mind in the authorial narrator’s language. One notices from these mental verbs that the description of Lambro’s state of mind and emotions includes both psychic action and behavior. These clues perform a key role in narration as they characterize Lambro; reveal the setting as temporarily mental; hence indicating the role of emotions in the mental functions of literature; and in the construction of narration. The mental and extra-mental verbs also reveal the forms by which the mind (and not just thought forms) contributes to narration. One may argue here that the representation of the mind need not just engage
consciousness forms since both behavior and mental actions in discourse (Palmer 2002: 38) that indicate a state of mind are also suited to construct a narrative level.253

Again in his description of Lambro’s attitude toward the festivities in his compound, the authorial narrator discloses, in the manner of one with omniscience, that ‘Lambro saw all these things with aversion / dreading that climax of all human ills’ (“Don Juan” III; XXV). Presenting Lambro’s attitude or state of mind by means of the psychic verb ‘aversion’ is an indication that the narrator sees and interprets this mind. If one were to rely on Palmer’s categories for the construction of fictional minds, one would find reason enough to blame Cohn (1978), Fludernik (1996) and users of free indirect discourse for paying less attention to other categories for representing emotions and dispositions that are not inner speech. Such categories that construct not reflectors, not focalizers, but psychological and even thoughtful characters in scenes of lonely self-communion (Palmers 2002: 32) only show the functions of psychonarration (omniscience) in constructing figural narration in third-person texts. If such modes of representing internal phenomena points out one of the peculiar ways Byron’s narrative poetry contribute to the construction of narration, the impression one gets is that ways of representing the mind are also an assessment of the extent to which Byron’s poetry provides devices for constructing narrative meaning.

Further examples that can illustrate narratorial unrestricted omniscience and presentation of the character’s state of minds254, (and which is crucial for our understanding of the manifestations of the reflector character to an extent, at least, to an extent) is the instance in which the narrator describes Juan’s feelings of regret about his departure from Spain: The reader is told that Juan was ‘bewilder’d’, (“Don Juan” II; XIII), ‘wept’, (“Don Juan” II; XVI); ‘sigh’d and thought’; ‘Reflected’ on his present situation and seriously resolved on reformation (“Don Juan” II; XVII). The reader is further told that Juan ‘felt that chilling

253 In Palmer’s (2002: 31; 38) opinion, areas of character’s mind that are not inner speech as mood, desires, emotions, sensations, visual images, attention, memory, dispositions, beliefs, attitudes, judgements, knowledge, imagination; and even action tendencies such as ‘laughter’, or behavioural descriptions (gay) constitutes tendencies pertaining to the mind; and therefore states of mind. Palmer adds that there is however a sense in which some functional differences between, on the one hand, the narrator’s report of an emotion (disappointment, stress or happy state of mind) and on the other hand, his report of a character’s behavior, motives and dispositions can be constructed as very different forms of states of mind and of behavior. These are significant for the analysis of internal processes in Byron’s poetry.

254 Palmer (2000; 31) uses the term ‘state of mind’ as a label for those areas of a character’s mind that are not inner speech; and also ‘covers episodes of current consciousness’ or mental phenomenon that are not inner speech such as mood, desires, emotions, sensations, visual images, memory, then latent mental states, dispositions, beliefs, judgments, attitudes, knowledge, imagination, interlect, character traits and habits of thoughts.
heaviness of heart’ (“Don Juan” II; XXI) especially when one is separated from his lover. Bewilder, felling, and reflection are used in relation to Juan’s mind. They are first, verbs that suggest a mind in action, and second, they locate action as internal. By means of these mental verbs, one is able to construct omniscient narration and the reflector and allow certain functions such as narration itself. Notice that the heterodiegetic narrator constructs the actions of other characters and also characterizes them. This also implies authorial narrator’s ability to understand human nature. The illusion of the presence of the reflector is made evident too. Based on the above mind-oriented strategies, one can construct both the authorial narrative situation and the figural one as hybrid forms. Consequently, narratological description of the figural narrative situation as constituted of mental verbs and psychic processes and characters fits well in the above analysis. In view of the centrality of mind strategies analyzed above, the reader cannot help see their contribution in Byron’s poetry in accounting for representation of consciousness in authorial (heterodiegetic) narration, the figural mode, and most importantly, their functions.

We have up till now been discussing the textual forms by which figural narration enters the poetry under study. We have shown so far that such narrative categories like the stream of consciousness, interior monologue, psychonarration, psychoanalogies and narrated monologue (free indirect discourse) can yield new insights into the study of the figural mode in poetry and can contribute significantly to questions regarding the uses of consciousness representation strategies in the analysis of Byron’s poetry. The techniques of indirect discourse and psychoanalogies provide perceptual, visual, and imagistic manifestations of the figural mode and mental states, and can therefore be useful guides when teaching, interpreting and analyzing Byron’s poetry in the light of its potential in reproducing both the figural narrative situation, the Romantic literary tradition and modern prose tradition that are rendered through the same devices. Seen as such, the devices can also perform ‘cognitive functions’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 44). The strategies can also serve as clues for staging the reflector mode in poetry, and in demonstrating the link that the poetry under study shares with the literary cultures that produced it. In addition, the figural technique has a literary historical function since it enables the reader to firstly, see Byron’s contribution in literary history in view of his narrative poetics, and consequently position Byron’s poetry within the larger historical context of the narrative. This can further guide an understanding that literary composition is not, and has never been a matter of epoch, but also of influence (as theories of
New Historicism and intertextuality\textsuperscript{255} have made us believe). There is an implicit understanding here that the figural device in some ways links Byron’s to cultures since the technique itself shows the relationship of Byron’s poetry to the Modern literary culture.

\textsuperscript{255} For theories of intellectuality and new Historicism that see literary composition as a matter, not of autonomy, but of influence, see Stephen Greenblatt (1988) among others.
IV. HOW FOCALIZATION IS USED IN BYRON’S POETRY

Focalization is a mediational tool (Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 71) and thus another theoretical domain in which the productiveness of transgeneric narratology in the analyses of Byron’s poetry can be explained. By means of the technique of focalization, the congenial relationship that Byron’s poetry shares with narrative and cultures can be justified. The strategies by which focalization enters a narrative poem and allows for conclusive statements that the text reproduces perceptions rather than telling or voice indicators are often many. The criteria for determining the focalizer of any given text must take into consideration the level of communication on which the focalizer is located (see Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 71-85 for this emphasis) as well as the degree to which the narrator or character appears as the source of perception that orientates the story. While focalization answers the question ‘who sees’, the criteria for determining its forms of textual manifestations (and consequently functions in a text) largely depends on whether events are rendered through the perceptions of a character in the story- what Stanzel calls ‘reflector’ the or through story telling frames (Nünning/Nünning, 2004: 114). Since focalization can be internal understood to mean the focalizing agent ‘who perceives, conceives, assumes, understands, desires, remembers, dreams’ (O’Neill 1994: 87) is inside the story as the character, or external implying that the ‘narrator- focalizers’ are situated outside the story, the typologies for describing them need to be differentiated.

256 For more on narrator-focalizers, see Rimmon-Kenan’s (1983: 71-85) conception that focalization can be both ‘external’ (pertaining to an external narrator) and ‘internal’ (when perception originates in a character inside the story) who are also heterodiegetic and homodiegetic respectively in reference conceptual terms. External focalization implies that the narrator who narrates can also perceive. Hence an attempt to justify external focalisation would depend on the use of certain perceptual frames and images that convey meaning only from the perspective of the narrator. In the eyes of narratologists, external focalizers are also called ‘narrator-focalizers’; while internal focalizers are variously termed ‘focal characters’, ‘character-focalizers’, ‘reflectors’ or ‘filter characters’ Chatman [1986 (2001: 120)], (Jahn 2005: N3.2.2). Note also, that controversial issues relating to focalization are raised by Chatman (1986) and Prince (2001), who particularly argue that the narrator situated outside the story was never present on the scene of the events and could not have perceived the event, and thus, should not merit the label ‘focalizer’. An exception to this role, according to Chatman, would be the homodiegetic narrating ‘I’ who saw the events and objects at an earlier moment in the story, but recount from memory and not from perception. See also Fludernik (1996: 343-347). Questioning particularly Princes’s, and Chatman’s reduction of narrator role to tellers, I join the debate on focalization by drawing attention to the fact that external narrators are endowed with unrestricted authority of knowledge and cognitive insight into other minds and are often everywhere where there is action (whether physical or psychic) and can therefore ‘see’ or perceive.
The particular categories of focalization which are considered here in view of their nature and appropriateness for the analysis of Byron’s narrative verse include, internal focalization understood as the refraction of perspective that occur when the characters in the fictional world function as ‘character-focalizers’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 122). I will also apply external focalization to analyze texts in which seeing; remembering, cognitive or perceptual frames appear to attribute perception to the narrator; and mixed when there is double focalization. In addition, I will use ‘fixed focalization’ in the analysis of poems or passages of it in which ‘factual events are perceived consistently from the perspective of one specific character throughout the narrative’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 123). Collective focalization will be used to answer the question of cases where perception appears to be that of a community through the voice of a single individual following Lanser’s (1992) thinking.

Focalization is evident in simultaneous narration. In the case of simultaneous narration, the homodiegetic narrator can reveal his attitude and perceptions while reporting. In his discussion of focalization, Phelan (2001: 57) brings into the realm of narrative communication another new possibility by means of the criterion of free indirect discourse when he argues that the narrator’s attitude, the blend of narrator’s focalization and voice with the character’s focalization and voice can result in the narrator’s focalization (the narrating ‘I’) containing focalization of the character (experiencing ‘I’). My analysis of focalization is not restricted to character focalization, but involves both the narrators and characters. In the case of narrator focalizers, the narrator, who may be authorial (heterodiegetic) can see and report what the character ‘sees’, ‘perceives’, ‘feels’, ‘imagines’, ‘thinks’ and ‘dreams’. In other words, the narrator can also see what the character had seen, or can perceive in memory. In the case of simultaneous narration, the narrator can remember and focalize at the same time especially in present tense passages (cf. Phelan 2001). In the case of character-focalizer, the agent who ‘sees’, ‘feels’, ‘imagines’, ‘dreams’ etc is the focalizer as distinct from the voice that reports the event.

Since each of the typologies of focalization has separate implications for the kind of focalizer employed (O’Neill 1994: 87), my criterion for identifying and analyzing focalization in the poems will depend on whether the verbs of perception, thinking, memory, and remembering as well as perceptual metaphors originate in a character inside the story, or in the thinking narrator who may either be heterodiegetic, or homodiegetic narrating I. If these verbs refer to the narrator who ‘sees’ what the character has seen, or who perceives in memory (Fleischman 1990: 217), or simply to the agent who is ‘observing the fictional world from an external position, then focalization is external. Cases in which the perceptions,
thoughts or feelings are attributed to a character inside the story, who then functions as internal focalizer, or ‘filter’ can be identified by means of proper nouns and personal pronouns in the third-person singular’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 123). The subject matter of the internal processes in the text, (Nünning/Nünning (2004: 123) described as ‘mind style’ and understood to mean the style used to relate thoughts and feelings of a character, will constitute further clues for determining and analyzing the focalizer of poetic texts in order to speak about their functions. My analysis of focalization will also be based on the strategies that direct the readers’ attention to the presence of free indirect discourse. This device is relevant for discussing mixed focalization understood to mean that both the narrator and the character are joined in the perceptual frame. Unlike the case of external focalization in which the past tense, memory and cognitive frames may locate or attribute perception to the narrator, I shall use such linguistic clues as free indirect discourse, perceptual verbs, cognitive, and emotional factors which include mental verbs, thinking, feeling, remembering and sensory perceptual elements to stage internal focalization. Free indirect discourse is particularly suitable because it also directs attention to the perceptions and psychic processes of a character whose thoughts, or feelings determine the story. The parameters of ‘viewing and experiencing’ (Fludernik 1996: 345), and one may add, all perceptive, cognitive and emotional elements within the consciousness of the narrator or character (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 122), will constitute my determining criteria for determining the ‘see-er’ (Fludernik 1996: 345) or perceiver in the poem. Mental verbs will help in determining whether focalization is external (if they point towards the narrator as the perceiver of the fictional world); or the internal if the activities of thinking, feeling and perceiving originate in a character. These criteria will allow the study to construct certain functions the focalizers make possible in the analysis of poetic texts. Furthermore, strategies by which the identity of the focalizer will be gauged and analyzed would constitute the use of psycho analogies (Cohn (1978). Psychoanalogies are forms of mental associations using imagery or metaphors, and are often linked to imagination which is an activity of focalization. Metaphors and similies will be considered as textual forms of psychoanalogies. Such a strategy will also allow the study to determine whether a given text is focalized from within or from the external level of communication in a bid to locate the activity of perception to the agent who perceives in images. The further implication is that in order to identify the focalizer in a particular passage or section of a poem, I will pay attention to both the focalized object and the subject of the
verb of perception, thinking, feeling, and remembering\textsuperscript{257} (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 123). Hence, my analysis of focalization involves the characters, narrators, as well as the object of perception\textsuperscript{258}. What I propose to do in this chapter then, is to demonstrate how focalization is used in Byron’s poetry. Since the question of constructing narrative and contexts implicates focalization, this chapter will attempt to show that focalization is an important factor in transgeneric narratological orientations. In order words, focalization provides perceptive, emotional and cognitive elements that are relevant for reproducing the story world, narrative communication, fictional minds, fictional characters, contexts and also narrative traditions in an apparently opposing genre like poetry.

The poems I have chosen for analysis include such novel-length narrative poems like “The Giaour”, “The Corsair”, “Lara”, “Don Juan”, “Parisina”, and “Child Harold’s Pilgrimage” \textsuperscript{IV}. These poems can be located in the contexts of the Romantic and specifically the narrative (prose) tradition since they provide mediation, narrators and focalizers and hence can be interpreted using strategies provided by transgeneric narratology.

It seems important to start an analysis of Byron’s use of focalization with the “The Giaour” because the poem is an effective illustration of the device, and more so, because like the others poems constructed in this manner, it offers sufficient basis to speak about the ample use of cognitive frames including viewing, seeing, perceiving and other mind forms that are necessary for the construction of focalization. Perhaps M. K. Joseph’s (1966 [1964]: 50-51) comment on the presence of many viewpoints in “The Giaour” should serve as a good starting point for my analysis of the way focalization is used in Byron’s poetry. Describing Byron’s narrative poems as ‘verse-novelettes’, he proceeds to describe the form of “The Giaour” in an analysis that implicitly sheds light on the notion of focalization:

The story is told fairly consistently from the viewpoint of a fisherman who appears at the beginning […]. This further developed and changed […] the single viewpoint is lost; […] and the effect of the

\textsuperscript{257} I do not however mean to say that all verbs of perception; thinking, feeling, and remembering, or that all the mind styles would convey the process of focalization. Some mind styles are simply states of behavior or emotions. Similarly, reports of mental activities which tend to be metadiscoursal commentaries on how the character was thinking (Too1an 2001[1988]: 119), are not considered in my analysis of focalization. This implies that I am considering only narrative sentences which contain clues reporting on how and what the character or narrator saw, perceived, or imagined.

\textsuperscript{258} The narrator can see what the character sees, perceives, feels, imagines etc, the narrator may also see what the character sees or perceives in memory. See Fleischmann (1990: 217), and also Chatman (1986: 217). Cf. also Fleischman’s argument that focalization can change from the narrator to the character. She explains that what changes is not the narrative voice, since the angle of vision through which events in the text are filtered are verbalized by the narrator hence, what changes is the perception that orientates the report (217).
originally allusive ballad-like structure is merged with different effects [...], (1966 [1964]: 48).

Two important factors often discussed with reference to focalization stand out clearly from M. K. Josephs’s analysis. His notion that the story is told from the viewpoint of a fisherman allows for an understanding that perception originates in a character. This suits our understanding of internal focalization even though his analysis reveals no references to perceptual verbs259 which determine focalization. M. K. Joseph’s observation that the poem contains many ‘viewpoint[s]’ culminating in different effects can also be understood as implying the presence of double focalization (although only implied and not explicitly stated in the quotation above). Although the term ‘point of view’ has been criticized by narratologists as a restricted definition of focalization, there is no doubt that ‘point of view’ is closely related to focalization and gives the reader the impression that there are perceptual references in the poem. On his part, Seed (1990: 17) sees a connection between “The Giaour” and the modern narrative technique, a claim he justifies by using as textual examples: ‘the presence of a series of narrators with limited knowledge and perspective’ and ‘the combination of narrative segments with multiple points of view’. Taking his argument further, Seed compares the poem’s narrative manner with that of 20th Century literature, specifically the fiction of James and Conrad citing as illustrative examples the poem’s fragmentary structure and the presence of narrators with limited knowledge or partial perspective such as the fisherman and Giaour. Interestingly, Seed (18) argues that the Fisherman is the viewer of the night scene and thus an important visual witness to Giaour who thunders up to him on his black horse, pauses a moment, and then is gone. Seed’s location of perspective to the Fisherman is in consonant with my use of internal focalization although he does not discuss the different types of focalizations the text features especially when the story is told from the perspective of the narrators he has cited. Whether or not there exist narratological grounds to illustrate the diversity of visions that the poem above constructs remains a central question whose answer is to be gauged in the analysis below.

To begin with, one of the very first opening stanzas of “The Giaour” (Pocock, 1948: 155) in which the fisherman perceives Giaour approaching the sea shore contains a number of

259 Chatman’s (1978: 152) analysis of ‘point of view’ criteria contains what he calls perceptual aspects (understood to mean the character is the center of view and physically present) and the ‘conceptual’ which refers not the character’s physical presence but to his attitudes or way of thinking, and also to how facts and impressions are expressed through thoughts. His analysis is relevant for a discussion of the different ways in which focalization operates: ‘point of view’ being the physical place or ideological situation or practical life orientation to which narrative events stand in relation (153). Hence, we would understand ‘point of view’ based on Chatman, not as expression, but the perspective in terms of which the expression is made.
remarkable perceptual and linguistic features that are often considered as typical characteristics of focalization. Considering that the text is cast in the third-person authorial narrative situation, the question one is likely to ask is that of the type of focalization constructed in the poem; that of what the object of focalization is; and also of who the focalizer is. A number of perceptual and mental verbs exist in the passage and can be criteria for determining the perceiver who is the character-focalizer in the narrative and who therefore operates under a different identity from the narrative voice. The claim that focalization is internal (Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 76-77) is supported by verbs that denote the activity of perception performed by the homodiegetic narrator (the fisherman) who is also a character in the story he tells. The story starts with a character perceiving a man in a dark boat along the sea shore: ‘far, dark, along the blue sea glancing, / the shadows of the rocks advancing / start on the fisher’s eye like a boat / of island-pirate’ (“The Giaour”, In, Pocock, 1948: 155). Since the fisherman who is also the character-narrator is the perceiver of the events (although the voice one hears is that of a covert authorial (heterodiegetic) narrator who is able to get inside the fisherman’s mind, follows him everywhere there is physical and mental actions to see and reveal what the latter sees), the story is told from his perspective. The reader should not be misled here to attribute perception or the activity of seeing to the covert heterodiegetic narrator who introduces the fisherman and tries to project his emotions and feelings. The focalizer of the events is the fisherman. From the above identified sentences, it is apparent that it is through the fisherman’s eyes or perception that the reader first notices Giaour, and through his attitude and interpretation of events that one receives primary conception of Giaour’s character (Kirchner 1973: 23) as the island-pirate. Granted that it is the fisherman that first sets eyes or perceives the Giaour the illusion created is that the judgement and attribution of activities of piracy to the Giaour’s motives is the idea of the fisherman. Such an illusion is apt to trigger an interpretation of the text as internal focalization.

When we meet the fisherman, he is not only a story character plying his boat to land at Port Leone; he is also the interpreter of the story, associating, in his mind, darkness, piracy, and destructiveness of passion to Giaour:

Who thundering comes on blackest steed,
With slacken’d bit and hoof of speed?
Beneath the clattering iron’s sound
The carvern’d echoes wake around.


Expressions that suggest audition or the cognitive event of hearing such as ‘thundering’, ‘echoes’ and ‘clattering’ are associated with the fisherman or internal character and constitute
further evidence that focalization is internal. The fisherman’s attitude towards Giaour which comes out clearly in his use of imagery describing the latter is part of the activity of focalization. The metaphor of ‘thundering’ is linked to the latter’s speed or way of movement. The images of ocean-tide and tempest are associated with Giaour’s passions and are also said to be calmer than Giaour’s heart: ‘And though to-morrow’s tempest lower, / Tis calmer than thy heart, young Giaour!’ (“The Giaour”, 155). This kind of mental associations suggests Giaour’s dangerous, uncontrolled or fiery passion. This is the work of imagination which in itself is an activity of perception linked to the fisherman. In such descriptions, the fisherman’s attitude of disdain for Giaour is implied. Supposing that the fisherman saw Giaour, and heard the ‘thundering’ movement of his horse, the descriptions of Giaour as a pirate and meteor of the night in the further lines should be logically his point of view. If one considers that associating human character and passion with destructive nature images such as tempests and thunder is part of imagination, one may likely see romantic literary tenacity for imagination conveyed by means of the narrative strategy of internal focalization. Narratologists will likely describe such a construction as internal focalization since it is the internal character (the fisherman) who perceives and make assumptions by means of adjectives such as ‘fearful’ ‘thundering’ and ‘clattering’.

Notice that verbs of hearing and seeing which occur in the further section of the narration also serve as indications that focalization is from within the fictional world, and thus internal. The reader is invited to notice that the narrator of the proceeding section is the one who performs the activity of hearing and that of reporting at the same time in the manner of simultaneous narration. Apparently identifying himself as a character in the narrative, the narrator reveals himself as ‘I’ and proceeds to report the approach of Emir’s band with a burden destined to be disposed off into the sea (apparently the body of Leila who is caught in adultery with Giaour). He uses verbs that allocate perception to himself as perceiver: ‘I hear the sound of coming feet, / But not a voice mine ear to greet; / The formost of the band is seen’ (“The Giaour”: Pocock 1948: 159-160). The band is carrying a bag which seems to contain a ‘precious freight’, infact a gem. The verb ‘hear’ is an activity of cognition often linked to focalization and draws attention to character in the story as the focalizer. The verb of speculative cognition ‘seems’ appears in the present tense and draws attention to simultaneous narration. Since the homodiegetic narrator is the one gazing at the mysterious bag plunged into the water, the association of the contents of the bag with something precious is part of the seer’s imagination. Moreover, the impression that the content of the bag is a ‘gem’ that ‘mock’d’ the ‘sight’ constitutes his point of view and is a further clue of some psychoanalysis.
that also contributes to an understanding of focalization as internal. One can logically draw from the above analysis that the strategy of internal focalization has a role to play for characterizing fictional characters. This is corroborated by the fact that verbs of perception, hearing, assumption, as well as the images of thunder and waves that are used to describe Giaour aptly project him as a potential threat, and by extension, reveal the narrator’s attitude of scorn and hatred for Giaour. If one goes by Rimmon-Kenan’s (1983: 77-82) inclusion of the psychological component to the analysis of focalization, then the profusion of nature images which are used for subconscious associations also convey or raise the question of who perceives, conceives, assumes, speculates which is a relevant criteria for focalization. These images constitute further narratological evidence that focalization is internal and simultaneous. The narrator who conceives through imagistic patterns goes further to convey the atmosphere of war or battle in apparently violent nature images. The reader is invited to note the profusion of suggestive violent nature images which are apt to convey an atmosphere of war such as ‘eddying whirl’, ‘breaking wave’, ‘the blast of winter’, rave; ‘thundering clash’ ‘the lightening of the water’s flash’ in ‘awful whiteness o’er the shore’, that shines and ‘shakes beneath the roar’ (“The Giaour”: 167). The waves are maddened as they meet. The association of things in images can only make sense from the imagination or subjective perspective of the character that sees the events happening. The violent and awe-inspiring ocean images convey the rampaging destruction and cataclysmic experiences often associated with war. Of importance is the fact that the homodiegetic narrator perceives in images. This has a relationship to internal focalization in the sense that imagination which is linked to imagistic associations is an activity of focalization.

Many other texts that typically create the impression of internal focalization come from “The Corsair”. The passage in which the omniscient narrator gets inside the character’s mind to reveal what the character conceives, dreams about, perceives etc, and which therefore makes sense from the subjective perspective of the character in question constitute illustrative instances of character or internal focalization. The following examples would justify my claims. In the fragment in which the omniscient authorial narrator of “The Corsair” (III: XIV) sees and reports that Gulnare gazes at Conrad and concludes that he is in a strange mood, focalization, or perspective appears to be that of Gulnare. The first thing the reader notices is that the pure narrative clause beginning ‘she watch’d his features’ identifies the character who is performing the act of focalization implicit in the pronoun ‘she watch’d’. On the basis of this fragment, the opinion that Conrad’s features, probably his mood is that of gloom, anger and even awe-inspiring (‘their freezing aspect that strange fierceness foreign’) are certainly those
of Gulnare who is observing the changing moods with feelings of anguish as she tries to interpret Conrad’s state of mind. In other words, expressions such as ‘freezing aspect’ and ‘strange fierceness’ that calls attention to Conrad’s mood only appear to make sense in the eyes of Gulnare who sees Conrad, observes his features keenly and tries to pass her judgement.

One can equally rely on mental states including emotions as further instances of how internal (character focalization) is constructed in “Lara”. Many texts in “Lara” offer psychic grounds to speak about internal and other types of focalizations. The scene describing a banquet animated by dancing and other activities (“Lara” I; XX; XXI) is told from the point of view of someone inside the story. The passage starts with a description of the impressions of someone observing a crowd. A perceptual verb like ‘gazed’ which appears in the sentence ‘Lara gazed on these, sedately glad, (“Lara” I: XXI) might denote Lara’s focalizing activity since it instantly indicates that focalization lies inside the story with Lara. The description of the ‘fluttering fair’ as well as that of the ‘prying and dark’ stranger gazing on ‘Lara’ appears to be interpretations emanating from Lara’s thinking and imagination because he is the one in the story experiencing the event. Again, in the description of Kaled in the battlefield, there seems to be traces of character focalization:

He turn’d his eye on Kaled, ever near,
And still too faithful to betray one fear;
Perchance ’twas but the moon’s dim twilight threw
Along his aspect an unwonted hue
Of mournful paleness, whose deep tint express’d
The truth, and not the terror of his breast.
This Lara mark’d, and laid his hand on his:


The reporting verbs ‘turn’d’ and ‘mark’d’ as well as the speculative fragment ‘perchance ’twas but the moon’s dim twilight throw / Along his aspect an unwonted hue’ are attached to the character Lara, identified as ‘he’, in the third-person singular. The verb ‘perchance’ in particular implies assumption and when applied to Lara could suggest that it is he that is doing the observation. Logically the description of Kaled’s physical appearance in a descriptive adjective such as ‘mournful paleness’ would be the opinion of Lara since he is the one watching Kaled and making observations and assumptions. What the reader infers from such an analysis is that Lara watches or observesor perceives Kaled, while the narrator narrates. Since the activity suggested by: ‘turn’d his eye on’ and ‘mark’d’ is a perceptual one attached to Lara, the words suggest his focalizing activities. Logically, the point of view which constitutes the activity and thus the story is that of Lara. Such an example is another
Another way character/internal focalization is made manifest in Byron’s poetry and allows for a construction of narrative meaning occurs in the omniscient authorial narrator’s description of Kaled as he watches Lara in his last dying moments: ‘he’ (Kaled) saw the head his breast would still sustain, roll down like earth upon the plain (“Lara” III; XXI). One way the text broadens our understanding of focalization is by introducing the third-person pronoun ‘he’, the perceptual verb in the past tense ‘saw’ as well as a simile that appears to contain a biblical allusion. We may start our analysis by asking who saw Lara’s severed head. The obvious answer is Kaled. Logically, therefore, the imaging of the death of Lara in nature is conveyed in the biblical allusion that says man was made out of dust and shall return to dust. This necessarily constitutes Kaled’s perception since he is watching the head as it rolls down the plain where it would rest for everlasting life. One may suggest here that the Biblical or religious doctrine that says at death the body returns to dust is reproduced in internal focalization.

Another strategy for staging focalization is the use of psychoanalysis in a passage below about Conrad’s thoughts as he waits anxiously for Gulnare. Internal focalization occurs in the passage about echoes from the stormy night during which Conrad is imprisoned:

Oft had he ridden on that winged wave,
And loved its roughness for the speed it gave;
And now its dashing echo’d on his ear,
A long known voice- alas! too vainly near!
Loud sung the wind above; and doubly loud.


There is implicit use of free indirect discourse in the rendering of the above passage. The psychological aspect that determines focalization and the focalizer in the above passage is the aspect of hearing. The reader may want to find out the indicators that, first, there is focalization; and second, that focalization brings the text closer to what Fludernik (1996) and
others describe as ‘internal focalization’. Following Bal’s (1985: 124) analysis of textual indicator’s of focalization, the starting point for my analysis here would be the identification of the event in the story, and eventually the actor who caused the event. The event in the story is the activity of hearing. The impression created is that of someone hearing the stormy wind blowing and producing noisy echoes. Following Bal’s criterion of focalization, there is no doubt that the psychoanalysis associating the wind with the image of an aeroplane (‘winged wave’) and subsequently to someone’s voice would be read as what Conrad hears, thinks, assumes or imagines. This claim can be justified in the sense that Conrad is the one performing the focalizing activity of imagination. Further, he appears to be sensitive to the specific resonance that sounds’ or echoes produce in stormy weathers. The phrase ‘a long known voice’ can be taken as evidence that the voice Conrad hears is a familiar one. Bal’s third criterion of the presence of a speaking agent who must name the event and its perception fits here as well. The text contains linguistic evidence of the presence of Conrad who names the perceptual activity of imagination. The focalizer, Conrad, is of a different linguistic identity from the narrator because he is identified in the third-person reference “he”. This means that the perceptual or cognitive activity of hearing and the attribution of wings to the waves to emphasize its speed constitute a rendering of imagination and thought processes in the mind of an identified thinker, Conrad. The psychoanalysis (metaphor) which attributes wings to stormy waves has an important role to play in the analysis of perception. The device shows that Conrad is thinking in imagistic patterns and therefore becomes important in locating focalization as internal. Such an illusion can also imply that a narrative description of perceptual processes can also depend on metaphors. The technique as such becomes important in the process of identification, interpretation, analysis and attribution of focalization. Furthermore, in an example like ‘he turn’d and saw-Gulnare, the ‘homicide’ (“The Corsair” III; XII), it is evident that Conrad, identified in the linguistic construct ‘he’ has seen Gulnare. Consequently, the abusive adjective ‘homicide’ when attached to Gulnare, should be assumed to be Conrad’s opinion and judgment. In another narrative sentence from a passage describing Conrad’s disdain for the crime of murder committed by Gulnare, the reader is told that ‘he gazed’ [...] followed by the conclusion that ‘in life itself she was so still and fair’ (“The Corsair” III; XX). It is Conrad, linguistically identified as ‘he’ gazing at Gulnare and making suppositions about the nature of her beauty and looks, and not plain narratorial report as the reader may be misled to think. The transition from narratorial report to an activity of perception is evident in the verb ‘gazed’ and in the third-person pronominal reference ‘he’ which both locate focalization as internal. In a similar example, ‘she gazed in wonder’, ‘can
he calmly sleep/ While other eyes his fall or ravage weep?’ (“The Corsair” II; XIII), the perceptual activity implicit in the verb ‘gazed’ originates from Gulnare. The activity of focalization is conveyed in ‘gazed’ and ‘wonder’, and also gives the impression of direct access into Gulnare’s thoughts. Both ‘gazed’ and ‘wonder’ (which is a manner of thinking) constitute perceptual elements within the consciousness of Gulnare, a character in the story, and hence supply further evidence of internal and variable focalization. By means of internal focalization, it is evident that Byron’s poetry provides ways of constructing narrative.

In my attempt to stage focalization in Byron’s poetry, a relevant signal like free indirect discourse cannot go unnoticed. The particular stanza of “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” IV that recounts an event, probably a contest in which a gladiator is dying in a fight scene offers relevant clues for an illustration of the functions of the technique of free indirect discourse in the construction and analysis of focalization. One important parameter that can be important for a reading of the above text as internal focalization is the technique of free indirect discourse. The technique is important because it permits the reader to notice the textual clues by which the activity of hearing, which also determines focalization, is performed by the gladiator. Free indirect discourse is evident in the sensory perceptual activity of hearing (‘he heard it’), a verb that permits the reader to attribute focalization to the agent who hears or perceives the event as distinct from the one who names the event and its perception. From line 9-11 of “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” IV, focalization is internal and appears to originate in the gladiator on the diegetic or story level. In these lines, there exist perceptual or cognitive grounds to speak about the character as focalizer of the events that constitute the story. If the determining factors of focalization are an object, and the perceiver of that object (Bal 1985), then there is indubitable evidence in the fragments as convened by ‘heard’. The passage focuses on someone in a fight scene describing spectators as ‘inhuman’. The event in the fragment which is particularly important for the plot of the story is the ‘inhuman shout which hail’d the wretch that won’ the fight. The reader therefore follows the event from the eyes of the agent who has heard the shouts, names the event and describes the spectators as ‘inhuman’. In the first line of the second stanza quoted above, the reader is told that ‘he (gladiator) heard it’. The pronoun ‘he’ when attached to the verb ‘heard’ signals a shift or transition from narratorial report to the activity of focalization which is conveyed in ‘heard’ and which is carried out by the dying gladiator. The gladiator’s feelings and his attitude towards the spectators watching the fight are expressed in mental language ‘before ceased the inhuman shout which hail’d the wretch that won’. The cognitive or perceptual verb ‘heard’ is very important because it directs attention to the gladiator as the focalizer, or
perceiver of the events in the story. The assigning of perception to the gladiator is also determined by the third-person reference ‘he’ in the singular. The use of a third-person reference in the singular signals the presence of a character in the story who perceives the event. Verbs of judgement and those that convey one’s attitude towards something such as ‘inhuman shout’, ‘wretch’, ‘rude’ convey the attitude of the gladiator towards the spectators, and suggest that it is his/her point of view that orientates the story. The reader is made aware that although the narrative sentences ‘I see before me the gladiator / lie / heard it / he wreck’d not of his life’ suggest omniscience unrestricted cognitive privileges of insight into other minds, the third-person reference is important for separating the speaker (interpreter of the events) from the agent who ‘heard’, and who, by means of such evidence is the focalizer of events. If the cognitive or perceptual verb ‘heard’ gives focalization to the gladiator, it is obvious that the description of the spectators as ‘inhuman’ emanates from the gladiator and not the authorial (heterodiegetic) narrator whose voice we hear. In other words, the word ‘he heard’ that signals a change of levels, should according to the rules of focalization accord perception to the gladiator. Consequently, the point of view in the phrase ‘ere ceased the inhuman shout which hail’d the wretch that won’ is that of the gladiator whose indignant and disagreeable attitude to the behavior of the spectators he regards as unjust, and unfeeling is implied in such descriptions as ‘inhuman’ and ‘wretch’. Consequently the accusation ‘inhuman’ implied in the word may constitute the disgust and irritation of the gladiator who is offended by the shouting or noisy spectators. One assumes, as such, that the projection of the feelings and responses of the audience is the duty of the gladiator who reveals in such descriptions highlighted above what he thinks about the audience and their attitude towards the contest. In such descriptions, the gladiator’s own attitude comes out clearly. The ‘inhuman’ spectators shout with glee, but the dying gladiator does not resent death and cares about his ‘rude’ hut, his ‘young barbarians’ and their mother. The reader would therefore realize that the qualifying adjectives ‘inhuman’ and ‘wretch’ is the work of he who heard the shout of the spectators and therefore attempt to express or convey the event to us by the use of verbs of consciousness. The presence of third person references, perceptual and declarative adjectives are suited to attribute the statements and opinions to the gladiator. One can thus rely on the above markers as evidence of one way in which free indirect discourse constructs internal focalization in Byron’s poetry, and by extension the narrative tradition of mediation.

Further passages of free indirect discourse occur in “The Corsair” and are important for a reading of the poem in the light of focalization. Passages of free indirect discourse occur in the following narrative fragments: ‘She gazed in wonder, can he calmly sleep, / While other
eyes his fall or ravage weep? / His eye seemed dubious if it saw aright’ (“The Corsair” II; XIII). The above narrative sentences appear to contain traces of what Stanzel (1971) or Cohn (1978) calls the reflector. Although “Lara” is cast in the authorial narration, third-person pronouns and mental verbs encourage an understanding that the story world is brought to life through the eyes of a character-Gulnare. The third-person pronoun ‘she’ and the perceptual indicator- ‘gazed’ are attributed to the character (Gulnare) by the narrator. The verb ‘gazed’ is a form of watching and would suggest an activity of perception performed by Gulnare as she watches Conrad who appears to be sleeping. Consequently, the opinion that the countenance of the character sleeping is deceitful: ‘His eye seemed dubious’, can be sourced to Gulnare who saw the event. The position of the perceiver inside the story suggests that focalization is internal. Similarly, narration in another passage from “The Corsair” (III; XV) is oriented not by telling indicators but by emotional elements within the consciousness of the story-internal character and allows the reader to assume that the perspective from which the spatio-temporal events are related is that of the reflector. The technique emphasized in the passage is narrated monologue or free indirect discourse since what is central to narration is the mind of Conrad wondering aloud:

And was she here? and is he now alone? 
What gem hath dropped and sparkles o’er his chain? 
The tears most sacred, shed for others’ pain, 
That starts at once-bright -pure-from Pity’s mine, 
Oh! too convincing – dangerously dear. 


The impression that the reader is carried directly into the psychic processes of a character can be justified firstly, by drawing attention to the fact that the text contains no traces of a mediator. The use of the third-person reference ‘he’ has the effect that the character meditating is inside the story. In the above passage, the presence of the reflector mode is evident. What is portrayed is the mind of the reflector (in Stanzel’s 1971 terminology)-Conrad wondering aloud or meditating upon Gulnare’s departure and passing subjective judgements on events. Meditation is assumed to be a form of thinking that constructs internal focalization. The presence of rhetorical questions, the use of past tense signals in ‘was’ and question marks (are markers of free indirect discourse) take the reader to Conrad’s mind. The profusion of question marks in ‘was she here?/and is he now alone?’ reveals reflections and signals the presence of a thinking mind or reflector whose meditation orientates the story. Another most important signal that the text is focalized from within is the personal pronoun in the third-person ‘he’ referring to the character Conrad. In addition, the deictic of place conveyed in the
word ‘now’ projects what David Herman (2003: 312) would describe as a ‘viewer-relative position’. Since the agent in the plot related perceptual sentences named ‘he’ is Conrad, and since he is the one that has seen tear drops on a chain, the subjective judgement that Gulnare’s tear drops has the value of a ‘gem’ (to suggest that it is precious) can be interpreted as Conrad’s point of view. Based on that evidence, one can attribute focalization to Conrad as the internal focalizer. The reader is thus made to follow events largely through the eyes or perspective of Conrad. By means of free indirect discourse, Byron’s poem provides grounds for creating first, internal focalization, and eventually reflector characters, a narrative technique well suitable for writing both third-person authorial narration and modern novels.

By relying on textual evidence the technique of free indirect discourse can provide the reader with further forms by which internal focalization can be gauged and analyzed to yield certain textual effects. The particular scene from “Lara” (I: X) where Lara wanders all alone at night along the ‘glassy stream’ is narrated in a way that his perceptions (evident through his thoughts, dispositions and desires) orientate the story. A mental verb, or one that points towards a wish or desire like ‘deem’d’, an indicator of the presence of a mind in deep meditation and thought like ‘contemplate’ and a verb of memory like ‘reminded’ are used directly in relation to Lara. The reader notices that what are represented are internal processes. While these devices serve to illustrate the salient characteristics of free indirect discourse, they also function to characterize the text as an example of internal focalization.

Still in line with the above, in his wishes and thoughts inferred in the words ‘deem’d’ and ‘contemplate’ respectively, Lara paints a romantic picture of a cold and noiseless night: ‘all was still, so oft in earth and air’ “Lara”, (I: X). Reflections run though his mind reinforcing evidence of internal focalization. The scene he is viewing ‘remind [s] […] him of other days, / of skies more cloudless, moon of purer blaze, / of nights more soft and frequent’, “Lara”, (I: X). The scene he contemplates not only reminds him of cloudless countries, but also of ‘hearts’ probably his loved ones. That opinions as well as the point of view from which the story is told are Lara’s is also supported by the fact that the narrator draws the readers’ attention to someone in deep thought and lone meditation: ‘he turn’d within his solitary hall, / he wandering mused,’ (“Lara” I: XI). ‘Muse’ may suggest thinking or dreaming and suggests that the action recounted is a mental one. The particular verb ‘mused’ like those analyzed above keeps the reader following events through the mind and perceptions of Lara. To claim, as one has done here, that focalization is internal becomes clear through such
mental reflections and wishes, and also in such forms of memory as ‘reminded’. It is also important to draw attention to the fact that the technique of internal focalization serves to characterize Lara as as a proud and snobbish person, and these are attributes often associated with the Byronic hero. Lara appears from such evidence to be the focalizer and one by which the author introduces the Byronic hero type to the poem.

Another passage from “Lara” (I: XVII) which describes some silent reflections by a group of people about Lara’s fate also makes good use of free indirect discourse and can be useful for the interpretation and analysis of internal focalization in the poem:

They guess’d, they gazed, they fain would know his fate.
What had he been? what was he, this unknown,
Who walk’d their world, his lineage only known?
A hater of his kind? Yet some would say.


In the passage above, the omniscient (heterodiegetic) narrator reports the perceptual activities of a group of characters in mental phrases. The reader may wonder who is the agent carrying out the activity of guessing and gazing as revealed in third-person pronouns such as ‘they guess’d, they gazed’. ‘Guess’d’ would suggest an act of making congeestures while ‘gazed’ points towards an act of seeing which are all focalizing activities. One may assume that ‘they guess’d’ and ‘they gazed’ represent the focalizing activities of a group of characters. In addition, the reflections of a group of characters are reproduced in the text by means free indirect speech (narrated monologue). Free indirect discourse leads the reader directly into the reflections and thoughts of a group of characters. Free indirect discourse also enters the text through such questions as ‘what had he been? What was he, thus unknown? / Who walked their world, his lineage only known? / A hater of his kind?’, and leads the reader directly into the mind of thinking or meditating characters identified as ‘they’. By means of such expressions that convey the illusion of letting the reader have an insight into the subjective and perceptual activities of characters, free indirect discourse can be used to construct an internal focalizer.

The reader is invited to notice that the text contains a plural personal pronoun in the third-person ‘they’ which is used in conjunction to the perceivers (evident in ‘they gazed’) who are at the same time making subjective construal about Lara’s fate, his lineage and temperament. A further passage from “Lara”, (Canto I: XX) also provides similar forms by which internal focalization manifests and allows for certain functions. The narrator discourse begins the passage by introducing the perceiver of events in both the perceptual and the third-
person pronoun reference ‘and Lara gazed on these’, and then switches to describe Lara’s perceptions, emotions and state of mind: ‘sedately glad’. The particular phrase ‘Lara gazed on these’ immediately establishes the internal position of the focalizer. In phrases like ‘his glance follow’d fast each fluttering fair’ / and also ‘he […] mark’d a glance so sternly fix’d on his- / […] / tis a face unknown, / But seems searching his, and his alone’, words like ‘glance’, ‘mark’d’ and ‘seems’ locate Lara as the reflector, perceiver and ‘experiencing character’ of the events in the story. The ‘face unknown’ that has fixed a contemptuous glance at Lara is described from Lara’s point of view as ‘prying and dark’. The comments about Lara’s emotional reactions point towards Lara’s silent reflections, and also suggest that although the story comes to the reader through the voice of the heterodiegetic narrator, he is distinct from the thinker by means of the devices identified above. The verbs of perception, the plural personal pronouns, and the series of rhetorical questions that mark free indirect discourse are signals for focalization and have further important functions as they are means by which the reader can separate the covert authorial (omniscient) narrator from the focalizer (perceivers and thinkers) whose mental reflections constitute the story. Mental devices again bring into the poem the modern narrative tradition typical of prose.

One crucial way of speaking about the forms by which internal and fixed modes of focalization enter a poetic text and permits certain functions is by focusing on the dream technique. The dream enters the texts of “Don Juan” IV (Pocock 1948, vol. 3) through free indirect discourse as would be shown below:

She dream’d of being alone on the sea shore,
Chain’d to a rock ; she knew not how, but stir
She could not from the spot, and the loud roar
Grew, and each wave rose roughly, threatening her;
And o’er her upper lip they seem’d to pour,
Until she sobb’d for breath, and soon they were
Foaming o’er her lone head, so fierce and high-
Each broke to drown her, yet she could not die.


Anon-she was released, and then she stray’d
O’er the sharp shingles with her bleeding feet,
And stumbled almost every step she made;
And something roll’d before her in a sheet,
Which she must still pursue however afraid:
’Twas white and indistinct, nor stopp’d to meet
Her glance nor grasp, for still she gazed and grasp’d,
And ran, but it escap’d her as she clasp’d.


The dream changed:-in a cave she stood, its walls
Were hung with marble icicles; the work
Of ages on its water-fretted halls,
Where waves might wash, and seals might breed and lurk;
Her hair was dripping, and the very balls
Of her black eyes seem’d turn’d to tears, and mirk
The sharp rocks look’d below each drop they caught,
Which froze to marble as it fell,-she thought.


And wet, and cold, and lifeless at her feet,
Pale as the foam that froth’d on his dead brow,
Which she essay’d in vain to clear, (how sweet
Were once her cares, how idle seem’d they now!)
[...] and the sea dirges low
Rang in her ears like a mermaid’s song,
And that brief dream appear’d a life too long.


The dream technique in “Don Juan” supplies an illustrative example of one form of manifestation of focalization. If one relies on the definition of focalization as ‘all perceptive, cognitive and emotional elements within the consciousness of the narrator or the characters, and [ranges from] processes such as thinking, feeling and remembering’ (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 122) to sensory perception and psychological components that include mental processes (cf. O’Neill 1994: 86-87), one is likely to start an analysis of focalization in the above passages by asking the theoretical question of to which textual agent the processes of dreaming, assuming, understanding, and desiring can be attributed.260 Certain features in the long passage about Haidee’s frightful dream are typical of focalization. One of these is the presence of perceptual ‘cognitive verbs’. The reader’s attention is directed to Haidee’s frightful dream, the visions that she sees in the dream and her impressions and psychological reactions. The presence of subjective elements and mental forms within the text are indicators that the perception or angle of vision from which the dream is narrated is that of Haidee, a character in the narrated world. The omniscient narrator recounts Haidee’s horrifying dream by letting the reader see events through her thoughts, feelings and impressions via the technique of free indirect discourse hence bringing the poem closer to the modern prose technique of figural narration. The dream itself is a psychic event because it is taking place in Haidee’s mind. The dream is narrated by means of mental or perceptual verbs. Judgements and elements of mind style are some of the features that describe perception and locate its source.

260 Interestingly, Rimmon-Kenan (1987, in Poetics Today 8.2: 417-438) makes a crucial point in the argument that while focalization is always a matter of ‘seeing’, the vision involved is not restricted to physical vision, but can also include psychological and/or ideological components which O’Neill (1994) analysis to mean who perceives, conceives, assumes, understands, desires, remembers, dreams.
These occur in numerous instances in the passage. In the very first stanza, the reader is told that Haidee dreams of being alone on the seashore, where she imagines herself chained to a rock. The terrifying and scaring visions she perceives and hears include ‘the loud roar’. In her imagination which is an element of focalization, she associates waves with rains pouring on her upper lip: ‘And o’er her upper lip they seem’d to pour, / until she sobb’d for breath’. She assumes that the ‘fierce and high’ waves are ‘[f]oaming’ over her head, almost drowning her, although she resists what she had assumed to be death. The fact that Haidee is the one who dreams, perceives, associates and experiences strange visions as suggested in such mental verbs as ‘dream’d’, ‘knew’ and ‘seem’d’, for example, gives the reader the illusion that the story is told largely from her perspective. The very verbs direct attention to Haidee as the story internal character. Haidee’s dream, her mental association of waves with rains, and her description of waves in such phrases as ‘fierce and hush’ constitute her subjective judgements, and hence her point view. By bringing events to the reader through the story internal character’s (reflector’s) eyes, the analysis supports my hypothesis that Byron’s poetry provides parameters for constructing internal focalization. One may also add that the element of imagination which enters the poem through free indirect discourse or its equivalent mode of manifestation-(dream technique) is one way of reproducing both focalization and the romantic literary tradition in narrative form.

The next stanza provides further details that suggest that the character whose psychic action orientates the story is a dreamer and perceiver of events, and thus, the internal focalizer of events. To begin with there are phrases that locate the position of the dreamer inside the story, and trigger the illusion that the reflector character’s thoughts and assumptions constitute the focus of the story. In “Don Juan” (IV:XXXII), phrases such as ‘she stray’d / o’er the sharp shingles with her bleeding feet, / and something roll’d before her’ / create the impression of someone moving and sees visions ‘white and indistinct’ that appear to compel her to pursue them. Similarly, an adjective such as ‘afraid’ and verb such as ‘gazed’ are both emotional and psychic processes that involve perception and suggest further manifestations of the reflector or internal focalization.

Further evidence by which the narrator makes the story visible through the consciousness and perceptions of the dreamer, (Haidee), and which are therefore important for characterizing the story’s focalization as internal is projected by means of free indirect discourse. In the third, as in the last two quoted stanzas, Haidee continues to experience the dream directly. She is the one who ‘thought’ (“Don Juan” IV; XXXIII) that she stood in a
cave, observing ‘marble icicles’. The subjective opinion that the walls of the cave are like a hanging grave; the impression that the hall is dripping with water; that her hair is wet and dripping; and the very imaginative element implied in the association of tears with frozen ice that transforms the rocks into a grave constitute forms of perceptions. Haidee is not only an observer. She perceives, assumes and makes subconscious associations. In her imagination, her eyes ‘seem’d’ turned to tears, which fall on rocks, causing them to freeze and form marbles. Her passions for her lover, Juan, ‘seem’d’ idle ‘now’ because Juan has become in her dream ‘wet’, ‘cold’, and ‘lifeless at her feet’. In a simile, she subconsciously associates Juan’s ‘pale’ figure to ‘the foam that froth’d on his dead brow’ (IV). She also hears the songs of the dead from the sea echoing in her ears ‘like a mermaid’s song’ (IV:XXXIV). When she performs the perceptual activities of gazing and thinking: (‘she gazed again on Juan, / She thought his face faded, or alter’d into something new’), Juan appears to her transformed into her father- Lambro (‘Like to her father’s features’). The devices direct the reader to see and understand events from the point of view of the character Haidee and suit our understanding of internal focalization.

The reader would realize that the list of strategies that determine and characterize internal focalization, and also construct reflector characters feature in the texts above by means of such evidence as ‘dreams’, ‘knew’, ‘seem’d’, ‘afraid’, ‘gazed’ ‘might’, ‘thought’ and by means of similes as well as mental verbs that denote feeling (suggested in ‘wet’, ‘cold’). These perceptual indicators are sustained throughout the text alongside the third-person personal pronoun ‘she’, and thus create the impression that the mind doing the focalizing activity of perceiving is Haidee’s, the reflector. Many functions can be constructed in view of the above signals of focalization. The mental verbs analyzed above give the impression of the mind in action, as well as set the story in the mind of the reflector-character and thus approximates modern fiction. In doing so, the mental tools lead the reader to see possible ways in which focalization, and even what Palmer (2002) calls fictional minds can be constructed in Byron’s poetry. Further, the same mental verbs and simile that evoke imagination or convey a sense of the mystical side of life including death and feelings of awe bring into Byron’s poetry the Romantic belief in mysticism and the imagination. Available evidence- linguistic, aesthetic and thematic situates Byron in literary history; we find him by means of the said evidence as one of the contributors of the Romantic poetics, both thematic and narrative. This is also the sense in which narrative is linked to culture.
A passage from “Don Juan” (III: XXVII) that describes Lambro’s return to his home after a long stay in the sea is suited to illuminate another way free indirect discourse is used in Byron’s poetry to construct narrative meaning:

He saw his white walls shining in the sun,
His garden trees all shadowy and green;
He heard his rivulet’s light bubbling run,
The distant dog-bark; and perceived between
The umbrage of the wood so cool and dun
The moving figures, and the sparkling sheen
Of arms (in the East all arm) - and various dyes
Of colour’d garbs, as bright as butterflies.

(Byron, “Don Juan” III: XXVII, In: Pocock, 1948.)

The passage contains various indicators that suggest that the focalizer of events is Lambro, and that focalization in the text remains fixed and internal. The passage introduces a character who not only sees but hears sounds. After the omniscient narrator’s report that ‘he saw his white walls’, he returns to Lambro’s opinion and observations that the walls were ‘shining’, and ‘the garden trees all shadowy and green’. Perceptual indicators are conveyed in mental verbs such as ‘saw’, ‘heard’ and ‘perceived’. The verb ‘saw’ suggests an activity of perception performed by Lambro, the character (identified in the third-person as ‘he’), to whom the view of the wood opens as he approaches his house. The accompanying observations about the freshness of the garden trees might be read as opinions of Lambro about what he has seen. In the preceding verses, the narratorial report and perceptual activity of hearing and perceiving contained in ‘He heard his rivulet’s […] / and perceived between /
The umbrage of the wood’ is immediately preceded by the perceiver’s (Lambro) imagination and judgment that ‘the wood [was] so cool and dun’. This is a subjective observation that appears again in Lambro’s imaginative association of the ‘sparkling sheen of arms’, the ‘dyes’ and ‘colour’d garbs’ to the kind of beauty and brightness that is often attributed to butterflies. It is important to note that the simile which compares the ‘sparkling’ or shining arms, the ‘dyes’, and coloured clothes the ‘moving figures’ are wearing to butterflies provides the reader with Lambro’s imagination of what the people he perceives moving between the woods are dressed to look like. What one notices in the text above is that the activities of seeing (‘he saw’), hearing (‘he heard’) and perceiving are used in relation to the personal pronoun in the third-person ‘he’ suggesting that Lambro is the focalizer of events and that it is his opinions, thoughts and imagination that builds up the story. The personal pronouns and mental verbs constitute enhancing indicators that it is Lambro’s subjective impression and imagination that is emphasized in the text and not just narratorial omniscience. Since events are ‘filtered’ in Chatman’s terminology through the eyes of the momentary reflector (Lambro) than through
the external heterodiegetic narrator, such mental indicators cited above are most likely to suggest further ways by Byron’s poetry can construct reflector characters and internal focalization.

In the further passages from “Don Juan” that provide information about Lambro’s astonishment at seeing an unexpected crowd gathered during feasting in his compound, fix and internal focalization take full force again. In the lines ‘He – being a man who seldom used a word / Too much, and wishing’ (III: XXXVII), there is a momentary display of narratorial voice, but after reporting that there is a hidden desire in Lambro, narration shifts again into a reproduction of Lambro’s perception inferred in the phrases: ‘he […] wishing gladly to surprise’, and his state mind ‘much more astonish’d than delighted.’ Cognitive indicators conveyed by verb and adjective of desire and emotions such as ‘wishing’ ‘and astonish’d’ respectively are used here to reproduce Lambro’s mind, but they also function as evidence that focalization is internal.

The task of producing meaning in narrative poetry is also achieved through collective focalization. In contrast to compound focalization, which occurs ‘when there is more than one focalizer involved, as when a character-focalizer’s vision is embedded in an external focalizer’s enveloping perspective’ (O’Neil 1994: 89), and even simple focalization, when a story is recounted from the perspective of a single character or focalizer, collective focalization conveys the impression that point of view and perception can be attributed to a group of people perceiving at the same time. With its markers ranging from the linguistic ‘we’ collective pronouns to forms of viewing and perceiving as well as judgements and opinions, collective focalization creates the impression that perceivers and thinkers are making assumptions concerning events they have witnessed. My illustrative examples come from “Lara” and “Don Juan” and they are treated together because they contain elements that point towards collective focalization. My first example of collective focalization comes from “Lara”, specifically the text recounting Lara’s strange activities in the night:

A:

Through night’s long hours would sound his hurried tread
O’er the dark gallery, where his fathers frown’d
In rude but antique portraiture around:
They heard, but whisper’d- ‘that must not be known
The sound of words less earthly than his own.
[...] Some had seen
They scarce knew what, but more than should have been.
Why gazed he so upon the ghastly head
Which hands profane has gather’d from the dead,
That still beside his open’d volume lay,
As if to startle all save him away?
Why slept he not when others were at rest?
Why heard he no music, and received no guest?
All was not well, they deem’d- but where the wrong?
Some knew perchance- but ’twere a tale too long;
[…]


B:
Juan and Haidee gazed upon each other
With swimming looks of speechless tenderness,
Which mix’d all feelings, friend, child, lover, brother,
All that the best can mingle and express
When two pure hearts are poured in one another,
[…]


Mix’d in each other’s arms, and heart in heart,
Why did they not then die? -they had lived too long
Should an hour come to bid them breathe apart;
Years could but bring cruel things or wrong;
The world was not for them […].


C:
They gazed upon the sunset; tis an hour
Dear into all, but dearest to their eyes,
For it has made them what they were: the power
Of love had first o’erwhelm’d them from such skies
When happiness had been their only dower,
And twilight saw them link’d in passion’s ties
Charm’d with each other, all things charm’d that brought
The past still welcome as no present thought.


In the passage (A) above, recounting Lara’s strange activities in the night, focus is on a group of people ‘they’ who ‘heard’ a sound of words uttered by Lara. There are various indicators that may trigger construal that focalization in the above passages can be attributed to a group of people focalizing at the same time. The most explicit marker that the story is filtered through a group of people focalizing simultaneously is the linguistic form ‘they’ which immediately locates the viewers of the two passages as story internal characters like in the other passages. The initial night scene in passage one introduces the participants in the story or scene of events as collective focalizers because they are referred to by means of a collective pronoun. In the entire passage, the perceptions of focalizers are reported in viewing and perceiving styles that denote speculation, doubts, desires and wishing such as ‘heard’, ‘seem’ ‘they scarce knew’, ‘Juan and Haidee gazed’, ‘why did they not die’, ‘they should
have lived’. In the night scene where Lara is said to have engage himself in strange activities, the reader is told that ‘they’ hear Lara’s footsteps over the graveyard (‘through night’s long hours would sound his hurried tread / o’er the dark gallery, / they heard’). The projective clue ‘heard’ is a mental activity associated to a group of people ‘they’ and constitutes an indubitable indicator that the vantage point from which the story is communicated is given through a collective. Lara’s footsteps are ‘heard’ threading over the graveyard where his forefathers are buried. ‘They’ also hear ‘the sound of words’ which in their opinion seems to be extraordinary: ‘less earthly than his own’. The very phrases ‘they heard’, ‘whisper’d’ ‘some had seen’ and ‘knew’ suggest the presence of some agents inside the story who hear, see and express opinions and judgements about events they have witnessed or perceived. The fact that these group of observers/perceivers wonder (‘they scarce knew what / why gazed he’) why Lara ‘gazed’ on ‘the ghastly head’ and reads through a mysterious ‘volume’ ‘as if to startle all save him away’, and also question why Lara neither sleeps, listens to music, nor receives guests also offers an opportunity to see that the thoughts and observations made represent some view point on the fictional world from a group of people. The description of the graveyard as ‘dark gallery’, the euphemistic reference to a state of death as ‘frown’d’, and the opinion that Lara groans mysteriously can be interpreted as imaginative perception, or assumptions from the people who heard, saw, or watched the events. The combination of personal pronoun ‘they’, the use of mental vocabulary in such words as ‘they heard’, the use of viewing indicators as ‘seen’ and ‘knew’ as well as the revelations about Lara’s mystical activities in the night all constitute to characterize the text’s focalization as collective. Since it is the manner of telling that makes focalization a collective one, such a category becomes important in allowing the study to show how both cognitive and linguistic devices are functional in analyzing and constructing meaning in poetry. We now turn to text B to explore additional peculiarities that may summon up an interpretation of focalization as collective.

In a manner analogous to the above text from “Lara”, another passage from “Don Juan” constructs its story in a way that allows for an understanding of how perceptual or psychic events could be turned into stories and narrated, and also suggests that focalization is a collective one. Collective perception is signaled in verbs like ‘gazed’ ‘charm’d’. As they gaze at each other, thoughts come into their minds. ‘The hour is dearest to them […]’, they feel they have been overwhelmed by love; happiness […].’ As they ‘gazed’ at each other, the feeling of fright haunts their minds: ‘even as they gazed’, a sudden fear invades their minds, and ‘swept, as ‘twere, across their heart’s delight’ (“Don Juan” IV: XXI). The presentiment of danger is perceived by the focalizers and in their opinion, has the magnitude of a burning
‘flame’. This comparison suggests danger. In the text, one finds two intimate lovers gazing at each other in silent meditation, and reflecting on love, death and a sojourn in the world of nature. To answer the question of the origin of vision through which events are filtered in text B, a convincing starting point would be to find out who is the perceiver of the events. Both linguistic markers and perceptual verbs from the passage answer this first question: ‘Juan and Haidee gazed upon each other’. In so far as the story-oriented perceptual activity of gazing places Juan and Haidee in the fictional world as agents watching each other passionately, and making imaginative projections, focalization comes closer to what narratologists construe as collective focalization. To further illustrate how collective focalization is made manifest in the text, one can identify the instance when the narrator tells us that far from simply gazing at each other in ‘speechless tenderness’, the imagination and wishes of Juan and Haidee are central to narration. In the mood of ‘speechless tenderness’ which is very congruent to the fact Juan and Haidee are in a love making event, these lovers imagine themselves as one and inseparable ‘mix’d in each other’s arms, and heart in heart’. Their further wish is for early death, a wish triggered by the fear that long life also come with hazards and crime: ‘why did they not then die? – They had lived too long / fears could bring cruel things or wrong’. Consequently, they shun the life of ‘cruel things or wrong’: ‘that world was not for them.’ One can say that this text is rendered in the manner of free indirect discourse because what one finds are the character’s thoughts in their own language. The feelings of a rejection of human society characterize by a life of ‘cruel things and wrong’ and the longing for a pleasurable life in the world of nature keeps haunting them: ‘they should have lived together deep in woods.’ The activity of wishing which is also one of the forms by which collective focalization enter the text is implied in the above sentence.

The verbs of perception analyzed above—an activity that the narrator attributes to a collective diegetic identity ‘they’—can be taken as signals for collective focalization. The imaginations and wishes projected in the minds of these characters are further signals that focalization is internal and collective. Their contemplation to withdraw from human society and live in the world of nature suggests the extent to which the techniques of focalization link the world of the text to such Romantic tendencies as the love for nature. This places Byron’s poetry within the framework of the Romantic poetic tradition. This aspect of literary history is an important function that collective focalization leads one to see.

261 See also Lanser’s (1992) collective perspective.
262 Also falls under Lanser’s (1992) category.
An interesting use of the device of variable focalization is evident in the last canto of “Lara” where a story-internal character (a serf) takes over narration and tells the story of what seems to be the circumstances surrounding Ezzelin’s murder,( which until now, had not been disclosed by the omniscient narrator). That focalization in the long passage is not fixed, but switches from the serf, to a horseman and back can only be justified through a careful analysis of “Lara” III: XXIV. The passage makes an interesting use of the device of internal focalization as it obliterates all manner of narration often associated with voice, telling or the presence of an identifiable speaker. The manner of narration draws attention to a variety of ‘viewing and perceiving’ (Fludernik 1996) features that an analysis of character focalization cannot ignore. The first set of predominant techniques which are important for locating focalization in the internal character (the serf) and not the heterodiegetic narrator constitute a cognitive verb of hearing like ‘heard’; a verb that draws attention to the fact that someone’s emotions or passions were stirred such as ‘roused’; and verbs of seeing and viewing such as ‘watch’d’ and ‘gazed’. Since perceptual processes that have taken the place of external actions, and that structure the story are performed by a character inside the story named Serf, it might be argued that those internal processes are reminiscent of the reflector mode of figural narration. After the narratorial report one finds in ‘he heard a tramp’ the next expressions would, according to the conventions of focalization be considered as a transcript of the Serf’s mind because the activity of hearing is performed by him. Not only does the verb ‘heard’ give perception to the Serf; the deictic ‘before him’ emphasizes his position inside the story, and on the scene of action. Given these two important clues, the description of a horseman who emerges from the wood, carrying a burden on his ‘saddle-bow’ constitute a narratorial rendering of what is registered in the mind of the Serf (into which we have access through perceptual indicators) who was present on the scene of events as perceiver. The two devices therefore separate the Serf’s perception from narratorial report. The Serf’s perceptual activity is further suggested in a viewing frame like ‘watch’d’. The sentence beginning ‘roused by the sudden sight at such a time, / and some foreboding that it might be a crime’, projects the Serf’s emotions, fear and perhaps judgement of what he perceives as unconventional. At the same time the conviction or opinion that the action he is watching is a criminal one, presupposes the Serf’s familiarity with the moral conventions of the society and his moral judgment. The conviction that the burden the horseman is carrying is associated with criminality and is the point of view of the Serf can be corroborated by the textual evidence that identifies the latter as the perceiver of the action undertaken by the former: ‘Himself unheeded watch’d’. Narratorial voice is evident, but the teller and the perceivere are
of two different identities. The observations and perceptual activities performed by the character inside the story constitute the angle of vision from which the story of Ezzelin’s murder is told, and are also indicators of the continued presence of internal focalization. As a functional effect, focalization in the above text introduces moral values (perhaps those often associated with Puritanism into which Byron was born) and criminality as the thematic context of the poem.

Focalization appears to switch momentarily to the horseman. After the report of his activities, ‘then paused, and look’d, […] and seem’d to watch’; the authorial heterodiegetic narrator withdraws temporarily; the reader is led directly to what the horseman is thinking as he constantly looks at the corpse he has disposed off in water: ‘as if even yet too much its surface show’d’. Focalization by the masked horseman is only momentary, as the narrator by means of the phrase ‘he caught a glimpse,’ takes the reader back to the Serf whose perceptions again become central to the story. From here onwards, narration is largely oriented by the Serf’s subjective opinions. Once he catches sight of the corpse disposed in water which he describes as ‘floating breast’, one finds him making mental associations suggested in his comparison of the ‘glitter’d’ gadget (apparently badge) ‘on the vest’ to a star. The Serf also views a bloodstain on the water. In the above analysis, the perceptual verbs, the personal pronouns or names, and the deictic of place suggest that it is the character’s thoughts and focalization that orientates the story. The techniques thus become important as they constitute further ways of constructing internal focalization, and by extension the narrative tradition of mediation in poetry. The perceptual forms also create awareness that mind styles can be transformed into stories and told in different ways. By means of styles of gauging focalization, it is possible to mark the homodiegetic narrator—the serf as a different narrating entity from the heterodiegetic narrator who is depersonalized and only inferred by the presence of language and omniscient indicators used.

Compound focalization (which is a mixture of external and internal focalization) is one way of interpreting and analyzing Byron’s narrative texts for the purpose of meaning forging. In a passage from “The Bride of Abydos” (a poem in which Selim falls in love with his step sister) the reader is told about Giaffir’s awareness of Selim’s undisclosed plans, and in the sentence that conveys this emphasis, indicators are given that there is fusion of narrator-focalizer and character-focalizer. The narrator reports about Giaffir’s and Selim’s states of mind in a complex way that suggests character–internal focalization as well as his knowledge of the two character’s habits of thoughts and intentions. When one attempts to interpret the
following passage as focalization, one is encouraged to think that what are central to narration as object of the passage are Selim’s mind and the impressions and awareness that Selim’s looks and appearance makes on Giaffir. A sentence like ‘for within his eye’ / He read how much his wrath had done; / He saw rebellion there begun: / (‘The Bride of Abydos’ I:V), is likely to trigger a reading of the text as authorial heterodiegetic narration since the impression that someone is contemplating rebellion attributes omniscience authority to Giaffir who appears to have direct insight into Selim’s mind (but for the fact that they are all inside the story). While the fragment ‘he [Giaffir] read how much his wrath had done’ suggests Giaffir’s interpretation of Selim’s mind, the second phrase ‘he saw rebellion there begun’ suggests the perception of someone more familiar with modes and emotions of others. Since Giaffir is the agent who perceives and projects Selim’s mind in a mood of contempt and since the phrase ‘saw rebellion there begun’ contains Giaffir’s inner thoughts and perception, the reader is encouraged to believe that focalization originates in the story-internal character whose impressions and awareness about Selim’s silent thoughts constitute the focus of the story. There is however, another possible reading to the passage, the impression of an apparent blend of narratorial omniscience and the thoughts and feelings of Giaffir. While the perceptual indicators in the passage, ‘he read how much his wrath had done / He saw rebellion there begun’ contains Giaffir’s inner speech and thoughts and suggest that Giaffir is the witness or perceiver of the psychic event and therefore character-focalizer of Selim’s silent intentions and rebellious motives, the sentence ‘he saw rebellion there began’ creates the illusion of one who is present everywhere including the mind, and thus, has knowledge about what a character has seen or is contemplating. The impression created when one interprets the two sentences is that Giaffir has cognitive prerogatives and knows that the former is contemplating revenge. The narrator has access to what each of the characters is thinking about the other and informs us in a manner close to omniscience. This, he does by letting the reader know the minds and intentions of Giaffir and Selim in a language that one expects the disagreeing agents to present their opinions. The two sentences thus suggest the presence of narratorial omniscience knowledge and report, and also Giaffir’s insight into his son’s mind who in his eye, appears to be meditating revenge. There is at this point in the text an interplay of thought styles and report, what Bakhtin would call ‘double-voicedness’263. It would

263 (Cf. Gunn 2004: 42) who argues that in Bakhtin’s understanding of ‘parodic stylization (301) and hybrid construction (304) Bakhtin uses free indirect discourse to mean a construction of ‘two utterances, two speech manners, two styles’ (304), ‘there is a mimicking of the character’s words, but these words are ‘permeated with the ironic intonation of the author’ (308). See also Roy Pascal’s ‘Dual voice’d’ style and Bal’s (1985) ‘narrative embeddedness’. Users of the term free indirect discourse including Gunn (2004) use the term to
logically be Giaffir’s point of view that Selim is inwardly contemplating rebellion, although following narratological conventions that impose barriers on story internal-character’s level of cognitive awareness; this would be considered parallipsis or a transgressive narration. The fact that the omniscient narrator reports what Giaffir is thinking leads to the impression of dialogical language and suggests that the passage adheres to both free indirect discourse and to what is called the ‘simultaneous appropriation of transmission’ (Bakhtin 1981: 424). In a sentence like ‘from within his eyes /He read how much his wrath had done; / He saw rebellion there begun’ (“The Bride of Abydos”, 1:V) the narrator projects Giaffir’s mind (in his mood of contempt) by means of the word ‘Wrath’. Selim’s motives are revealed. Although the line ‘He read how much his wrath had done’ contains Giaffir’s inner mind and thought, it also permits the conclusion that the narrator has access to what is going on in the character’s mind at the moment and thus reports it. In other words, although the impression created by the two sentences is that Giaffir has knowledge about Selim’s intentions, the narrator also have access into these unspoken intentions.

In another dimension, compound focalization is one way the above passage contributes to create narrative meaning. While perceptual phrases such as ‘He read’ and ‘He saw’ would suggest that Giaffir is the eye witness or one that caused the psychic event and therefore the character focalizer of Selim’s silent intention of rebellion, the passage ‘He saw rebellion there begun’ suggests both Giaffir as perceiver of Selim’s intention and also an external voice present in the other’s mind, having knowledge of what the character has seen or is contemplating. The narrator as such appears to know what the character-Focalizer knows. Focalization is thus located both within the eyewitness (Giaffir) and the covert external (heterodiegetic) third-person narrator. The two sentences thus suggest the presence of narratorial knowledge, and of Giaffir’s insight into his son’s mind that appears to be contemplating rebellion. The description suits our understanding of double focalization. In the text, there is an interplay of thoughts styles, what would be called double-voicedness; phrased by Pascal (1977) as ‘dual-voiced’ style. What is particularly noticed in the above analysis is that the quoted sentences evoke a combination of psychonarration associated with authorial narration and free indirect discourse associated with the story internal characters. The technique of compound focalization becomes productive here in the sense that it leads the reader to see the extent to which Byron’s poetry offers narrative techniques that permit an account for a fusion of narratorial report and character’s thought. But dual focalization need not only take into account seeing or perceiving verbs but also consider the narrator’s knowledge of the character’s mood, intensions, and knowledge).
engagement with narratology. The technique is apt to link Byron’s poetry to the narrative tradition of story telling.

In contrast to the passage quoted above, which appears to be focalized by both the external narrator and Selim, focalization changes in the second canto of “The Bride of Abydos” (II: VIII) especially in the stanza where the focus of perception appears to be that of the character Zuleika. That Zuleika is the character–focalizer of the events is illustrated by a passage that recounts her visit to the ‘grot’ where she finds Selim strangely dressed: (‘since last she visited the spot / some change seem’d wrought within the grot; / Her eye on stranger objects fell / What may this mean? She turn’d to see / Her Selim –‘oh! Can this be he?’). A reading of the text as focalization is likely to begin with the question of who the viewer/perceiver of events is, and that of the level of communication on which he/she is located. The object of the above passage is Selim’s strange manner of dressing, his appearing in a mode unfamiliar to Zuleika, and the effects on Zuleika that provoke certain impressions and thoughts from her mind when she perceives the former. The claim that Zuleika is the character–focalizer of the above passage is, first of all, illustrated by the perceptual expressions: ‘Her eye on the stranger fell’ and ‘seem’d’. The viewing and perceptual indicators ‘fell’ and ‘seem’d’ which orientate the story are associated with the character ‘she’ as focalizer. The evidence locates perception directly in the agent in the text who saw (Selim) although the voice that is discernible is that of the covert heterodiegetic narrator who informs the reader that Zuleika saw Selim. Free indirect discourse is introduced by means of questions and exclamations: ‘What may this mean? Oh! Can this be he?’. The rhetorical questions reproduce Zuleika’s silent thoughts, and perhaps also her astonishment at seeing Selim surrounded by piles of weapons. Further, the phrase ‘she turned to see / Her Selim’ gives the impression of someone, a covert heterodiegetic narrator reporting about the agent in the story performing the action of seeing. The reader therefore realizes that opinions, assumptions, observations and thoughts on which the interpretation of the above passage is based are those of Zuleika who is in the scene of action watching Selim. The free indirect discourse segments suggested in the above lines may be useful in differentiating the narrative voice (‘who speaks?’) from the internal-focalizer (Zuleika) who perceives and assumes that Selim is unusually dressed. While the same clues indicated above may cue the reader to see elements of the reflector mode of narration in manifestation, they become some transgeneric means of constructing focalization and narrative situations in poetry and thus of speaking about Byron’s contribution to the development of narrative poetics. Such forms of focalization are also apt to bring into Byron’s poetry generic elements that are narrative and may help to explain while
narrative theory can work theoretically and analytically in an apparently opposing discipline like poetry.

While viewing and perceptual indicators including mind styles can be interpreted as convincing, illuminating as well as productive representations of characters’ feelings, dreams, thought processes, emotions, and thus of internal focalization, the full impact of the narrative poems cannot be analyzed without consideration for psychoanalyses or imagery (which can also highlight further forms and uses of focalization in Byron’s poetry). That is to say, imagery may constitute another means by which the character’s thoughts, feelings, imaginations, perceptions and dreams can deployed to construct focalization. In an earlier analysis, we attempted to demonstrate the role of psychoanalyses in the interpretation and construction of a narrative situation as authorial omniscience heterodiegetic. The technique can also play a productive role in the analysis of focalization especially when metaphors and similes (which are all textual manifestations of the device) are used in a text. Our illustrative example comes from “The Giaour”. That imagery offers narrative evidence for speaking about psychoanalyses and its uses as a focalization technique is nowhere evident than in Byron’s poem “The Giaour”. Right from the beginning of the poem, the Giaour is perceived and described by the Fisherman (who is the character and homodiegetic narrator of the poem) by means of imagistic analogies, hence his visibility and description is done by means of metaphors of perception. The night scene, in which the Giaour is seen by the Fisherman, the perceiver of the activity, is brought to the reader in the visual description ‘blackest stead’ and suggests the opinion of the viewer. The similes: ‘meteor like’, ‘like the Simoen’ and especially metaphor of thundering, which suggests Giaour’s violence of temperament and movement, and which are all used in reference to Giaour transforms him, by way of analogy in to an element of danger. Since the fisherman is the viewer of the night scene and thus an important visual witness to the Giaour, who thunders up to him on his black horse, stops for a while, and then is gone, one is likely to locate perception in him - at least following narratological convention that the agent through whose perceptions, consciousness or emotional elements the fictional world is filtered (Nünning/Nünning 2004: 118) is likely to be considered the focalizer of the events. As witness of the scene, it is apparent that questions like ‘who thundering comes on blackest steed, with slaken’d bit and of hoof of speed?’ can be

264 For the use of the phrase in a similar context, see Cohn (1978: 41-57), see also Wallace Martin (1986: 140) in a corroborative statement.
attributed to the fisherman. One is likely to assume that it is the fisherman who lets the reader have a glimpse of Giaour by means of imagery.

Apart from the visual details that give the impression of someone who sees, imagines and admires the horse and thus describes it from his perspective, the tempest images associated with Giaour’s ‘heart’ may suggest violence of temper and also create an awareness of the presence of someone who knows and perceives the mind through images:

    Though weary waves are sunk to rest,
    There’s none within his rider’s breast;
    And though tomorrows tempest lower,
    ’Tis calmer than thy heart, young Giaour!


By means of imagistic associations, the simile in the above passage directs the reader’s attention to the way in which events are perceived with the result that the process of imagination embodied in the psychoanalysis, presupposes that the fictional world can be known by means of perceptual images. The Fisherman who is the narrator focalizer presents the scene by interpreting and reporting Giaour’s state of mind and temperament in the manner of someone who perceives. The images linking the waves or tempest winds to Giaour’s mind to suggest a state of internal conflict draw the reader’s attention to the nature and function of the psychoanalysis in the above passage. The idea of conflict, violence and danger conveyed in images such as tempest and waves is used in reference to Giaour. While such destructive nature images, when associated with Giaour may represent or presuppose Giaour’s unrestrained wrath and turbulent emotions, it is important to note that the comparison derives from the fisherman’s point of view, the man who certainly perceives and tries to interpret the mind by means of imagistic associations. In doing so he creates awareness about his opinion and attitude towards Giaour. The narrator instantly takes the reader to the ‘story-time past with the fisherman announcing how much the sight of the horse reverberated in his memory’ (Doherty 1968: 63). The story continues to be told by means of imagistic patterns which the fisherman evinces when he perceives Giaour heading along the shores and describes his movement as thunderous: ‘Who thundering comes on blackest stead / And not a star but shines too bright / On him who takes such a time’s flight’ (“Giaour”, 155-156). In addition to the metaphorical analogy of Giaour’s mind and tempest, the ‘hyperbole of the couplet which is interpolated into verse description of the rider’s movement’ [...] suggests an ‘experience and knowledge which, we might think, must be denied to the Fisherman’ (Doherty 1968: 63) (although he is a character inside the story and is denied omniscience knowledge according to narratological convention). One might argue that Giaour’s characterization in ‘thunder’ and
‘tempest’ images only reveals the role of the device of psychoanalogy constructing internal focalization.

The fact that the Fisherman is the eye-witness narrator (homodiegetic yet perceives and knows about mental states of other characters suggested in the psychoanalogy that associates the latter’s mind with ‘tempests’ is suited to compel critics like Doherty (1968: 62) to worry about ‘who can see or know’. In other words, ‘the eye witness position [of the fisherman inside the story] does not permit the focalizer to penetrate into the mind of the focalized’.

Seen as such, the image of tempests associated with Giaour suggests violence and locates (perception) internal (to the story) to the Fisherman - the conceiver of the image. The image also appears to credit the latter with omniscience, the cognitive privilege of insight into other minds, a prerogative narratological theory of mediation would conventionally deny a homodiegetic narrator like the fisherman. Imagery here may play a thematic role and also characterizes the Giaour. The waves or tempest are reported to be calmer than Giaour’s mind. The expression characterizes Giaour as someone with violent temperament. The narrator instantly takes the reader to the story–time past especially when the Fisherman discloses that the sight of the horseman echoed in his memory. There is irregularity in the use of tense especially as the narrator switches to the historic present when he describes Giaour’s movement along the shore.

A further illustrative example of the forms and functions that can be made of double focalization in the poetry of Byron occurs in a passage from “The Giaour” in which the heterodiegetic narrator describes the mind of the Giaour in a mode of deep meditation. In the same line of argument as put forward in the passage above, the succeeding passage allows the reader to follow the story simultaneously from the Giaour’s point of view as the perceiving character and also from that of an external agent ‘more intimate in his knowledge of feelings and psychology’ (Doherty 1981: 63):

’Twas but a moment that he stood,  
Then sped as if by death pursued:  
But in that instant o’er his soul  
Winters of Memory seem’d to roll,  
And gather in that drop of time  
A life of pain, an age of crime.


265 Dan Shen (2001: 162; 159-172) discusses the issue of transgressions of modes of focalization in more detail.
Indicators of memory seem to locate focalization to the character in the story because they convey the fictional world by means of the character’s speculations and assumptions. There is a double focalization in the passage in the sense that perception can be attributed to both Giaour and narrator of the text. The speculative phrase ‘as if’ appears to source the opinion that the rider runs in the manner of someone pursued by death to the Fisherman narrator who is observing Giaour moving along the shore. The speculative cognitive verb ‘seemed’ encourages the reading that Giaour assumes that memory revives in his imagination his delinquent past life but also presupposes that the external narrator also sees into the mind that assumes. In that sense the focus of perception appears to be concurrently that of both Giaour and the narrator. Nonetheless, there are grounds to argue that a shift in focalization is introduced by the same perceiving verb ‘seemed’. In the narrators report about Giaour’s feelings, thoughts and imaginations as he runs along the shore, the reader is told that ‘Winters of memory seem’d to roll’ and bring into his imagination his painful and criminal past. The expression ‘seem’d’ on which focalization is based cannot, of course, be considered as the narrator’s conception or manner of thinking. When it is linked to the previous passage, it shifts the point of view to Giaour who is apparently psychologically absorbed in deep thoughts and guilty feelings and silently laments his psychological condition (although the voice the reader hears is that of the fishermen narrator reporting the psychic event). One may as well argue that if the expression ‘as if’ gives point of view to the narrator, the verb of speculative cognition discernible in ‘seem’d’ appears to play a double role as it simultaneously attempts to convey Giaour’s imagination and omniscient point of view. Focalization in the above text enables an understanding of how a mental event like imagination could be transformed into a story and narrated. The modern impression of the mind as a source of literary material is evident in such imagistic constructions. Focalization also has a thematic function in the above analysis. The technique attempts to unveil Giaour’s past life steeped in crime, a theme that comes up often in Byron’s poems that deal directly with typical attributes of the Byronic hero.

Focalization in the above passage can be external also. To answer the question of how external focalization features in the above text, the reader is likely to ask the question who sees or perceives or even penetrates into Giaour’s mind. Although the passage is depersonalized, the expression ‘winters of memory seem’d to roll’ gives point of view to the Fisherman focalizer, who acts as homodiegetic eye – witness, and thus assumes unrestricted access into the mental activities of Giaour conveyed in the phrase ‘A life of pain’. But it is significant that this knowledge about Giaour’s imagination and awareness is the conception of
the Fisherman-focalizer who uses the verbs ‘as if’ and ‘seem’d’ to convey this effect. What the reader is allowed to see is the case of a homodiegetic external narrator (narrating ‘I’) who is a participant in the events he recounts, yet assumes cognitive access into the consciousness of the story internal character-Giaour, a privilege narratology reserves only for omniscient authorial narrators. In so far as the narrator is located in the fictional world and yet claims access into Giaour’s inner thoughts and imagination, the mode of narration conveyed is similar to what Dan Shen (2001: 162) describes as ‘superficial internal focalization and essential omniscience’, phrased in other words as ‘transgressions of modes of focalization’ (159). Apparently, a postulant in the mode of inquiry called transgressive narration, Genette (1980: 195-197) had warned that ‘a narrator or focalizer, when adopting a given mode of focalization, will not transgress its boundaries’. The bearing the impression that a homodiegetic has insight into the imagination or psyche of other characters has is that it conveys the impression of parallax which Genette (1980) understands to mean giving more information than is narratologically authorized in homodiegetic narration. Although homodiegetic omniscience is interpreted in the context of this study as transgressive narration, the technique nonetheless sheds new light on the specific way events are mediated in Byron’s poetry, and eventually the nature and function of focalization in the poetry of Byron.

Another typical example that illustrates the effectiveness of the device of collective focalization in the analysis of Byron’s poetry can be traced in the narrative device ‘we’ in “Lara”. A passage from “Lara” which focuses on Lara’s dying moments in the battlefield may shed light on the forms and functions of the device of collective focalization in the analysis of Byron’s poetry: ‘But from his [Lara] visage little could we guess, / so unrepentant-dark-and passionless’, (II: XIX). Collective focalization appears to be the focus of the quoted lines in the sense that the perception that sets the story appears to be that of a group of focalizers. The very statement ‘we guess’ implies a way of thinking which is associated with the ‘co-focalizers’ of Lara’s mind who include presumably the narrator and the characters in the story or other witnesses to Lara’s death. Relying on the assumption that the event of

---

266 See Dan Shen (2001: 199). For more on transgressive focalization, see Dan Shen (2001: 171-172) and Jahn (2005).

267 On the definition and forms of ‘We and Narration’, see Uri Margolin (2001: 241; 241-254). In this article, Margolin examines the role of ‘we’ forms of narration raising the question of their functions as ‘narrative-voice indicator, as focalizer-experiencing character, and as narrated entity, arguing that the ‘we’ pronoun is not simultaneously uttered though the utterance often ‘posses the status of a group or collective speech acts’ (243). A relevant definition of ‘we narrative’ goes back to Fludernik (1996: 224-225) and also Jahn (2005: N3.3.1) who understands ‘we narrative’ to mean a form of homodiegetic first-person narrative in which the narrator’s experiencing self belongs to a group of collective internal focalizers.
viewing conveyed in the previous phrase originates in a group of focalizers, the construal that Lara is a sinner as suggested by the word ‘unrepentant’ (associated with the pronoun ‘we’) would logically be a collective conception or assumption conveyed. While the ‘we’ pronoun strategy, when linked to the perceptual verb ‘guess’ (which is a manner of thinking) explicitly positions the narrator of “Lara” in the narrated world and also identifies the narrator as ‘as one of the witnesses to Lara’s death and by implication one of the Otho’s band’ (Marshall 1962: 53), the cognitive verb ‘guess’ introduces one textual manifestation of focalization and enables the reader to identify the individualized collective ‘we’ as the focalizer-experiencers of Lara’s features and internal states.

There is yet another possible reading to the above passage. The reader needs to be reminded that until the above quoted sentence, the narrator of “Lara” is covert, authorial, external to the action, unobtrusive and has been the ‘interpreter of much of the action’ in the sense that ‘he sees and reports events from a position external to the characters’ (Marshall 1962: 53). Yet, he steps into the narrated world as suggested by the word guessing: ‘But from his visage little could we guess’. The importance of the verb of thought ‘guess’ needs to be attained to since the illusion created by the phrase ‘we guess’ is that an authorial narrator has step into the action of the story as internal focalizer. When the authorial narrator momentarily enters the action of the story, he not only assumes the status of a homodiegetic-character participant, but surrenders his cognitive prerogatives as well. This claim can be accounted for by the fact that in order to have insight into Lara’s gloomy state of mind that he describes as ‘passionless’, ‘dark’, and ‘unrepentant’, he resorts to guessing. The perceptual verb ‘guess’ would seem inappropriate if the narrator had reported from his former external position as authorial heterodiegetic narrator. The mental activity of imagination or guessing seems to be a more appropriate device used by the momentary character-narrator ‘to get around the restrictions of the field of internal focalization’268. The use of the phrase ‘we guess’ in a third person authorial heterodiegetic narrative like “Lara” suggests authorial restricted knowledge, conveys the impression of transgressive narration or parallipses and brings narration closer to what narratologists call ‘unreliable narration’269. What one notices is the case of unreliable heterodiegetic narration. As another functional effect, the mental activity implied in ‘we guess’ permits a reading that two opposing tendencies of focalization are at work—the narrator playing the dual or multiple role of collective-focalizer, and external focalizer, and also

268 For the use of this phrase, see Dan Shen (2001: 165) in a different context.
269 For more on unreliability, see Nünning/Nünning (2004), Hühn (2004), and Allrath (2005).
character-focalizer simultaneously. If we concede that the phrase, ‘we guess’, locates focalization in the external narrator, then Chatman’s (1986) objection to narrator as perceiver can be challenged. One may add that while the above analysis may suggest (in line with Genette’s (1980: 198-199) opinion) that both narrator and character can focalize an event, Chatman (1986: 194) would regard the use of focalization in the context of authorial (heterodiegetic) narrative text “Lara” as a violation of the norms of discourse and story. The device becomes the means by which transgressive focalization enters the text. In addition, the ‘we collective’ focalizer device raises the question of collective focalization as yet inconceivable in the poetic theory of transgeneric narratology which this study attempts to update to become more productive in poetry analysis. Notwithstanding the ambiguities introduced in analysis by the device, it becomes very important in singling out another important contribution Byron ushered in the development of Romantic narrative poetics, and can thus account for the link between the poetry under study and the narrative (prose) tradition.

The exploration of narrative poems which discuss internal, collective, compound and external focalizations have illustrated a range of possible strategies and plausible functions that the device of focalization can allow the reader to construct in the analysis of poems. By portraying the fictional world through features of narration such as free indirect discourse, psychonarration, verbs and adjectives of perception and consciousness, opinions, emotional elements, perceptions, feelings, imaginations, assumptions, judgments, imagistic associations and dreams, some of Byron’s narrative poems may shed light on forms of textual manifestations of characters, narrators and perceivers. There is also an understanding that focalization is not a concept which is inert, but a strategy that can be constructed from textual evidence that asks and answers the question of ‘who sees’ using parameters of viewing and experiencing (Fludernik 1996: 345), including mind styles. While the same strategies of focalization foregrounded in certain narrative poems have revealed that the perceptions and psychological dispositions that characterize the story can emanate from a character, an external narrator or from a group of thinkers focalizing simultaneously, the identity of heterodiegetic narrators and story-internal characters can be staged by linguistic and other indicators that determine focalization. An exploration of focalization in homodiegetic narration and heterodiegetic narration also renders obvious that narrators can transgress cognitive limits set for them by narratology. To read narrative poems in the context of focalization allows for an understanding of the extent to which external narrators and characters are involved in the narrative process of constructing the fictional world, the
fictional minds, and their textual identities. The strategies analysed above perform further functions. They help the study to determine the level of communication on which the focalizer is located and further, to determine the type of focalization constructed in the chosen texts. Of importance is that fact that staging focalization in Byron’s narrative poems not only highlights poetry’s involvement with the narrative tradition, the Romantic literary tradition, and with moral and thematic issues of certain epochs, but also demonstrates what the study assumes to be Byron’s contribution to the historical development of Romantic narrative poetics. Such an understanding is important to the ways focalization and its strategies of discussion are interpreted in the present study as a link between Byron’s poetry and the narrative tradition.
A transgeneric narratological analysis of narration and focalization in Byron’s narrative verse aiming to illuminate an understanding of what Byron’s poetry offers that can be analyzed narratologically (and further, that can link the said poetry to issues of contexts as a secondary goal) constituted the major goal of this study. A modification or synthesis of transgeneric narratological approaches to poetry criticism, which constituted the theoretical part of the study, was attempted through integration of structuralist and context-sensitive narrative representations drawn from insights of narratology and cultural narratology. Consideration was paid to the role played by certain categories of narratorial voice, focalization, metannarrative elements, consciousness representation strategies, culture symbolic indicators, tense categories, and perspective structure in forging the interlink.

By bringing together narrative categories to answer questions concerned with mediation by drawing on insights from classical and post classical narratology, a transgeneric narratological poetic approach to mediation was evolved. As a result of the synthesis, narratorial voice, mental forms, perspective structure, tense forms, consciousness representation strategies, metannarrative indicators, linguistic devices and perceptual patterns for determining focalization emerge as categories of the analysis of textual manifestations of authorial heterodiegetic narration, the first-person homodiegetic forms, the figural narrative situation and focalization. The transgeneric narratological model of mediation allowed the study to reconceptualize critical focus on mediation in distinct forms. A broad and systematic exploration of narration and focalization based on textual determinants of identification, differentiation and interpretation were evolved in the hope that a proposal of strategies for discrimination may serve as a starting point for the reconceptualization of transgeneric narratology. Given the profusion of the formal, mental, perceptual and extra-mental and also contextual aspects of narrative in Byron’s poetry, the approach was aimed to enable an understanding of the kinds of narrators and focalizers a reader can construct in a narrative communication process; and the kinds of functions that can be constructed. Since narrators, like focalizers are located on different levels of the poetic texts, and enter the texts by means of a variety of forms, they were treated differently. In attempt to propose innovative
transgeneric critical concepts, and strategies for discussing mediation in poetry, the theoretical chapter was divided into three distinct phases.

An important area of transgeneric narratological modification of mediation, which constituted the first part of the theory chapter, was the concept of voice, and perspective structure. My argument here was that narrative enters poetry through voice and linguistic devices. Similarly, the relationship of Byron’s poetry to specific cultures including narrative, the post colonial, colonialism and the Romantic literary culture cannot be forged without consideration for narrative itself and its representations which include voice, perceptual indicators, narrating agents, perspective structure and culture symbolic patterns (that can be transformed into textual subjects and endowed with voice) such as narrating animals. Other forms of mediation that give rise to narrative transmission of meaning and link Byron’s poetry to cultures include consciousness representation strategies, mental forms, free indirect discourse, psychanalologies, collective, fix, internal, compound, and ambiguous focalization. Considering both linguistic and culture specific elements (exemplified in the above categories) together as factors determining narrative, the transgeneric narratological model of poetry criticism postulated by Hühn (2004) and elaborated on by Hühn and Schönert (2005) was modified.

The question of which categories of mediation can constitute transgeneric methodological and analytical tools of analysis was answered by making recourse to clues to authorial heterodiegetic, first-person narrator (homodiegetic), and the figural mode. Their textual manifestations comprise, in different degrees of textual emphasis, formal and thematic procedures, personalized reference, covert signals; extra representational factors, reader address signals, metanarrative elements, omniscient clues, consciousness representation strategies including free indirect discourse, psychonarration, self analytic techniques and others. Strategies for interpreting and analysing the various categories of focalization chosen for the study such as mental verbs, free indirect discourse, dream techniques, psychanalologies, and viewing and perceptual indicators were proposed.

In attempt to demonstrate the productiveness of transgeneric narratological categories developed in the theoretical chapter for the analysis of narration and focalization, and consequently enable an understanding of the link between the poetry under study and culture, the study chose some of Byron’s poems written in the narrative tradition of story telling or mediation. By means of strategies of psychonarration, metanarrative commentaries, psychoanalologies, reader-address strategies, linguistic devices, tense styles and perspective,
authorial narration was analyzed in poems such as “Don Juan”, “Child Harold”, “The Corsair” and others to reveal certain functions. Since first-person narrative devices constitute a further transgeneric means of staging narration in Byron’s poetry and, consequently, the relationship that its shares with specific cultures, categories such as homodiegetic narration, communal voice, culture-narrating objects and their approximate devices (covering self-narration techniques, character perspective, linguistic devices, action-oriented verbs, tense styles, parallipses and unreliability etc.) were used as interpretive devices in “The Lament of Tasso”, “The Prisoner of Chillon”, “Mazeppa”, “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” III, “The Prophesy of Dante”, and “Churchill’s Grave”. In view of the prominence and the uses that can be made of the figural narrative situation in Byron’s narrative verse, attention was also paid to narrative modes for gauging and analyzing the reflector. These include narrated monologue (free indirect discourse), psychonarration, psychoanalysis, interior monologue/stream of consciousness and mental verbs that denote the presence of a reflector (or its forms of manifestations in a text). Texts such as “Lara”, “The Corsair”, and “Don Juan” were used as staging grounds. The strategies for determining perception discussed above were also used to construct forms of focalization and eventually speak about their uses in Byron’s poetry.

The selection of Byron’s texts that are used to test and explore the theoretical assumptions of the thesis has made obvious the hypothesis that narratorial voice, perspective, culture-narrating objects like animals; mental, and perceptual manifestations of focalization constitute analytical categories for staging the functions of narratology in Byron’s poetry. In another dimension, the text corpus has also illustrated that the transgeneric narratological model of narration and focalization is indispensable for any attempt at a narrative staging of issues specific to mediation and culture in poetry.

An exploration of narrative poems dealing with storytelling/mediation has triggered the illusion that variegated functions can be constructed when narration is staged by means of voice strategies. The forms by which authorial narration enters the poetic texts and triggers an illusion of narration as authorial heterodiegetic suggest that narration in Byron’s poetry is created by means of voice signals and consciousness representation strategies. Although the modes of narratorial voice on which the first-person homodiegetic forms is staged in Byron’s poetry appear to be different from forms of representing authorial narration, each of the forms contributes to creating specific cultural contexts, a narrative identity and, thus, a narrative situation. Of importance is the productiveness of first-person linguistic categories of narration like communal voice and perspective in staging the intersecting grounds between this poetry
and post colonial cultures, and consequently, in bringing into the realm of Byron’s poetry an apparently interdisciplinary focus.

Further potential roles that can be attributed to narratorial voice discussed under authorial heterodiegetic and first-person forms include a narrative illustration of mediation, a narrative staging of fictional subjects and their different identities, a narrative staging of textual agents on the story plane as distinct from those in the external communication level as well as a narrative rendition of the extent to which non-human agents like animals and also tense features can be endowed with a diegetic identity and entrusted narrative functions. In addition, both linguistic and thematic forms of voice not only function as a means of narratorial self-portraiture, but also constitute forms by which the narrator introduces, and characterizes other characters or agents whose actions are important for the analysis of narration.

The repertoire of analytical devices for authorial narration has further different functions. Since they function as analytical devices, they also allow for a more ‘systematic discrimination and analysis of the levels and forms of mediation than are traditionally distinguished in poetry criticism (see Hühn 2004: 49 in a different context). Further, textual forms of authorial manifestations such as tense aspects, narratee strategies, personalized references, linguistic signals and metanarrative devices reveal the extent to which Byron appropriated the narrative tradition, and opens up new ways of analyzing Byron’s poetry in the light of narration hitherto ignored in the analysis of the said poetry. Further functions performed by authorial narrators as discerned in texts are many. The narrator is responsible for narrative transmission and he is the link between the author of the narrative text and the reader. It should also be noted that he helps establish the narrative as well as characterizes other characters. He also contributes to plot development, and - most importantly - he becomes the means by which thematizing, intentions, generalizations, digressions, and the narratee enter the narrative. These very strategies are significant in speaking about the extent to which Byron’s poetry provides strategies for the writing of fictional narratives, for the construction of narrative situations and eventually permits the study to link narratology to cultural history.
The importance of the role of narratorial voice for a transgeneric construction of mediation can be emphasized in poems that construct the authorial and the homodiegetic narrators. “Don Juan” and “The Corsair” for instance, tell the story of protagonists in third-person references. Like many others written in the same manner, “Don Juan” for instance, provides narratorial report on how Lambro is thinking when he suddenly returns and finds a feast in his compound. The strategies of third-person references and omniscience provide grounds for the reader to see a distance between the authorial narrator and the first-person narrator who often identifies him/herself in first-person references as in “The Prisoner of Chillon”. In addition, narrative strategies of covertness and omniscience which are likely to draw attention to an interpretation of a text as authorial are further distancing strategies that may account for the identity of narrative authority. From such textual evidence, the reader would also be able to infer the degree of privilege, limitations, authority, and freedom to intrude by commentary, digressions and dialogue as demonstrated in the analysis of authorial narration in “Don Juan”.

Poems written in the first-person and third-persons were also analyzed to reveal the ways self-narration strategies of simultaneous narration, and retrospective forms construct narration in the same narrative level under separate identities. Poems that construct their narration not necessarily by means of voice forms, but by categories transgeneric narratology reconceptualizes under consciousness representation strategies and mental forms of rendering fictional minds can certainly have important functions for the ways narration is used for a staging of mediation and also for the ways mental elements influence the analysis and interpretation of a textual speaker as figural or reflector mode. One of the objectives of using the figural mode for staging narration has been to highlight the ways mental and consciousness representation strategies can construct textual subjects, narrative situations and narrative meaning in general. Poetic narratives or even fragments from “Lara”, and “The Corsair” amongst others have been analyzed to reveal the ways questions of narration can be answered by a reliance on categories such as free indirect discourse, psychonarration, psycho analogies, the stream of consciousness, and other forms of mind styles. In the above poems, the importance of consciousness representation strategies for a construction of narration in the figural mode is emphasized. The differences to be discerned in the ways first-person homodiegetic and authorial heterodiegetic narrators tell their stories can be linked to

270 Not however that the presentation of events by the authorial and the homodiegetic narrators differ in ways that can be linked to the differences between the opposing concepts of heterodiegetic and homodiegetic narration, an incompatibility that is determined by narratological conventions.
differences between the reflector mode of figural narrated texts and narratorial voice. Due to the fact that these narrators tell their stories using different narrative means, the clues to their identification can constitute systematic ways of separating them as distinct narrative agents. The analysis of narrative poems devoted to free indirect discourse, psychoanalogies, stream of consciousness ad psychonarration, which are so central in staging the figural mode are likely to call up the hypothesis that transgeneric narratology enters Byron’s poetry by means of narrative features the poetry itself constructs. In view of these points, the narrative poems analyzed under figural narration do not only highlight ways in which mental features construct narration. They also shed light on the extent to which the narrator’s involvement in psychic actions that constitute narration brings the poems closer to modern emphasis on psychological setting and psychological characters. Studied against the background of the figural mode of narration, the poems highlight the ways psychic subjects reveal their identities by means of transforming their minds into narrative settings for stories.

The figural agent plays further roles in the narrative poems that are similar to that provided by the first-person forms and the authorial narrator. He/ she is responsible for narrative transmission, he/she is a link between the author and reader, he/she makes the mind a source of poetic material. The variety of strategies discussed above may help the reader to understand textual differences between the narrator and characters who do not tell by verbalizing, but whose thoughts and reflections often constitute the psychic event on which meaning is grounded. The manner of narrating by thoughts and voice aspects situates Byron in the classical and modern prose traditions and also encourage a conclusion that Byron was already pioneering a modern narrative tradition of story telling in the Romantic literary period. If one agrees with Cohn (1978: 175) that ‘formal changes happen historically’, the presence of both formal and contextual clues for analyzing narration in Byron’s poetry may help account for the place he holds in literary history of the development of the Romantic narrative poetics. Voice and mind forms (mental and extra-mental), psychonarration, narrated monologues (free indirect discourse), interior monologues, psychoanalogies and all other forms that create the impression of a ‘narrative summary of a character’s thoughts’ […] (Wallace 1986: 140) allow the study to draw conclusions that Byron’s poetry provides strategies for constructing narration and focalization, and for linking poetry to issues of culture and narrative that classical narrative theory and even genre theory of poetry ignored.

Textual clues which suggest the interpretation of a text as focalization such as free indirect discourse, psychoanalogies, internal focalization, verbs of speculation and clues that
suggest an act of perception were analyzed in poems such as “Don Juan”, “The Corsair”, “The Giaour”, “Lara”, and “Childe Harolde’s Pilgrimage” amongst others. The analysis of such poems makes it possible to point out a number of conclusions which hinges towards the functions of focalization. Perceptual specific clues to focalization are important for the ways different agents in narrative transmission tell their stories, and can be constructed. Psychoanalogies, mental verbs, thought forms, dream and free indirect discourse techniques are some ways that enable the study to determine the perceiver of events that orientate the story and eventually the identity of the agent whose perceptions guide the story. It has also been noticed that external narrators and character- narrators focalize in different ways. In a poem like “Don Juan”, for instance, the perceptions of Lambro, Haidee and Juan (who are all characters inside the fictional world) are rendered through the dream technique, mental verbs of seeing, knowing, wishing, and free indirect discourse. In “The Giaour”, the fisherman’s perceptions come through to the readers by means of internal focalization, and also by means of verbs of seeing, gazing and hearing. The same is true of “The Corsair” where the text is focalized from within by means of metaphors (imagistic patterns) or Psychoanalogies and verbs of astonishment and seeing. In “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” IV, and also “The Corsair”, the mode of focalization is free indirect discourse. Certain texts from “Don Juan” construct external, but also collective focalization by means of verbs that denote wishing, hearing, omniscience, and speculative cognition. On its part, “The Bride of Abydos” features compound focalization. The fact that focalization is rendered differently can be linked to the differences between the contrastive concepts of internal and external focalization. This gives the reader the possibility of inferring the kind of narrative perspective or agents emphasized in Byron’s narrative verse, or fragments of it involving the narrative process of reflection.

Also noticeable is the fact that there exists a link between narrative modes of rendering consciousness of the reflector and those of staging focalization. The repertoire of devices intended to function as categories of the figural mode and focalization also introduce one fundamental narrative characteristic of poetry - the psychological impact. Poems that tell stories by means of consciousness and perceptual strategies place poetry in conjunction with the modern fictive propensity for psychological settings and mental characters. The analysis of poems written in the narrative tradition of focalization, voice, perspective structure, and mental strategies of reference has revealed further ways Byron’s poetry provides strategies for constructing narrators and narrative situations. Such a reading also guides the reader to see certain ways Byron’s poetry works in bringing together diverse disciplines like poetry and narrative fiction, which remain otherwise unconnected in literary culture. The analysis also
guides an understanding of the plane where poetry, cultures and narrative can intersect. This is justified in the sense that the poetry under study provides linguistic strategies and perspective structure (which subsumes voice, focalization, narrators and characters) for constructing context specific issues like colonialism, post-colonial subjects, the Romantic literary culture and fictional narratives. One may also argue that the range of categories and strategies of mediation and focalization discussed in the study demonstrate, on the one hand, that applying transgeneric narratology to poetry analysis does not result in the obscuring of the oppositions underlying poetry and narrative fiction, and narrative and cultures on the other hand. Rather, the strategies outlined encourage the reader to determine the specific features in which poems are distinct from novels (see Hühn 2004: 149). The potential of transgeneric narratology to solve narrative problems across genres only raises such illusions that theories do not necessarily build on criteria, genre, or convention, but they are open, and allow for synthesis. The analysis of poems written in the narrative tradition triggers the illusion that the work has an intellectual relevance that cannot be overlooked. One may not conclude without pointing out that the poems analyzed here are functional for the determination of the forms and the extent to which poetry constructs the narrative tradition. They are also necessary for the determination of the functions narrative poetry dealing with story telling and context-sensitive issues may have played in the shaping of narrative and imperialist mentalities implicit in its textual representations.

**RELEVANCE OF THE THESIS**

The work has an intellectual relevance. Considering the integrative, systematic and dynamic nature of its methodology, one may say that the study joins the ongoing interdisciplinary debate in literary and cultural studies on linking narrative to issues of culture and contexts in the hope that the strategies that evolved from this alliance may be theoretically and analytically productive in poetry criticism. In addition Byron’s poetry for which the approach is intended falls within the framework of Romantic literary tradition, a course which is offered at the Secondary and University institutes of learning in Cameroon. The work may expedite or foster research in that it offers additional knowledge to students and researchers interested in narrative aspects of Romantic literature. In order for this influence to be felt, attention should be paid to theoretical perspective, methodology, voice, perspective structure, metanarrative devices, narratee signals, consciousness representation strategies, focalization, context, structure, and literary analysis. In other words, the study provides conceptual,
methodological and analytical tools for answering questions in poetry that is written in the narrative tradition. It is also hoped that the work will provide a nurturing synthesized, comprehensive, conceptual framework and narrative scientific models to the Cameroonian researcher, and particularly students in literary studies who, as a result of insufficient documentation has no access to books on classical and post classical narrative theory and cultures. There is no exaggeration in saying that Cameroonian students writing theses have often betrayed a lack of adequate insight into certain relevant aspects of a good thesis, the most important being methodology of research, drawing a line between the project and existing literature, and also relating literature to cultures and discourses outside it. It is hoped that researchers interested in developing transgeneric narratology further or in investigating the relationship Byron’s poetry share with both narrative and specific cultures (for example, ethical issues such as Law and gender that also find relevance in Byron’s poetry) can elaborate on genre, narratee signals, linguistic and other voice markers.
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