



جامعة المنصورة
كلية التربية



**The Impact of Aristotle's Poetics on Modern
Narratological Approach:
A Phenomenological Study**

By

Mariam Rizk Awadallah

*Demonstrator of English
Faculty of Education
Mansoura University*

Under the Supervision of

Dr. Abeer Elgamal

*Associate Professor in English Literature
Faculty of Education
Mansoura University*

Dr. Basheer Eisaway

*Professor in Criticism
Faculty of Education
Mansoura University*

Journal of The Faculty of Education- Mansoura University

No. 127 – July . 2024

The Impact of Aristotle's Poetics on Modern Narratological Approach: A Phenomenological Study

Mariam Rizk Awadallah

Abstract:

Contemporary Narratology has been a deduction to what has been suggested by Aristotle (384-322BC) in his Poetics (335BC.) This thesis aims at chronologically tracing narratological concepts introduced by Aristotle in his Poetics to show their development and progress over the years. A phenomenological appreciation will be rendered to display the ramification and the diversion of modern narratological criticism from the Poetics. The study compares between Aristotle on one hand and modern critics son one of whom is David Lodge (1935-).

Key words: Narratology, Structuralism, Narrative Grammar, Fictional representation, Linguistic mediation

مستخلص البحث

إن علم السرد المعاصر ما هو إلا إستنتاج لأراء أرسطو (٣٢٢-٣٨٤ ق.م) في كتابه علم الشعر الذي أصدره في عام ٣٣٥ قبل الميلاد . يهدف هذا البحث إلى تتبع تاريخي لبعض الأفكار السردية التي تم إستعراضها من قبل أرسطو و إستعراض تطور هذه الأفكار عبر السنوات . و سوف يتم تناول الموضوع من منظور ظواهرى لعرض تشعب و تفرع هذه الأفكار السردية المعاصرة من كتاب أرسطو علم الشعر . هذه الدراسة تظهر نقاط التلاقي بين أرسطو من جهة و بعض النقاد الاخرين امثال هنرى جيمس (١٨٤٣-١٩١٦) و بين كلايسون بوث (١٩٢١-٢٠٠٥) و اى.ام. فورستر (١٨٧٩-١٩٧٠) و ديفيد لودج (١٩٣٥-).

Narratology and Structuralism:

It is worth considering that recently there has been a great development in narratological research. Narratology, a science that was neglected for a while, now is fruitful and rich. This reawakening in the field or revival is due to the enhancement to the theories (*Narratology beyond Literary Criticism Mediality, Disciplinarity*, Jan Christoph Meister, Tom Kindt and Wilhelm Schernus, *passim*).

However, Jonas Grethlein (1978-) believes that, “For a while, it looked as though narratology along with its structuralist agenda and scientific aspirations would be swept away by the anarchic force of deconstruction” (153). Grethlein goes on stating that narratology has survived “the Dionysiac reign of poststructuralism” and “has come to bloom” producing many “new narratologies” (153).

It is worth considering that many modern narratologists tried to reach an all-inclusive theory describing the narrative. Monika Fludernike (1957-) mentions the narratologists' various trials to found a comprehensive theory of narratology stating that scholars like Franz Karl Stanzel and Gérard Genette tried to bring together the multiple theories to form a comprehensible system. They also tried to study how such theories relate to one another in only one narrative text. Fludernike, also, mentions the trials of scholars like Chatman, Prince and Bal to put a framework or a range of options or choices to help storytellers compose their narratives. In addition, they tried to classify and categorize narratives (Fludernike 88).

One of the really important and pioneering figures interested in studying such a development in the narrative theory is David Lodge (1935-). Lodge looks for the capability of all recent narratological theories to be implied to one text. But who is Lodge? What are his achievements in literature and literary criticism? What are his contributions in the field of narratological field?

An English author and critic, and a professor at the University of Birmingham, Lodge devoted most of his time writing and studying literary criticism. He is responsible for the production of the so-called Campus novels – novels which offers a criticism to academic life. His *Campus Trilogy*, *Changing Places: A Tale of Two Campuses* (1975), *Small World: An Academic Romance* (1984) and *Nice Work* (1988), sets new spheres rich in ideas that can be explored by other novelists. He is also known for his use of varied narrative techniques. He is truly knowledgeable and excels in the narratological techniques that he even studied recent narratological theories and tried to classify them in his article "The Analysis and Interpretation of Realist Text: Ernest Hemingway's Cat in the Rain".

All recent narratological theories stem out of or at least relate to structuralism- a movement interested in studying the structure of human experience, language and culture. So, what is structuralism? How does it relate to literature? Who are the leading figures of structuralism? How is it possible to study structuralism in relation to other movements? Within the scope of this study, can structuralism be a common factor/methodology and the starting point of both in Aristotelian narratology and recent narratological research?

Let's start by answering the last question which is our major concern. As was previously mentioned in chapter one, Aristotle's approach to literature was rather structuralist. Treading the same path of Aristotle (384BC-322BC), Henry James (1843- 1916) and E. M. Forster (1879-1970)

were also structuralists. Anglo-American Narratology depends majorly on the opinions of James and Forster which were almost structuralist (*Postclassical Narratology Approaches and Analyses*, Jan Alber and Monika Fludernik, *passim*).

James and Forster were both a connecting link between the narratology of the ancients and modern narratology crystalized by the works of French narratologists. Luc Herman (1959-) and Bart Vervaeck (1957-) state that all recent narrative theory "finds its roots in the work of the French structuralists" (41). They go on mentioning the scholars, who were affected by structural thinking, like Roland Barthes (1915-1980), A. J. Greimas (1917-1992), Claude Bremond (1929-2021) , Umberto Eco (1932-2016) , Gérard Genette (1930-2018) , and Tzvetan Todorov (1939-2017) who "introduced the term narratology" (41).

Fludernike believes that "the classical phase of narratology developed as a strand within structuralism in France and includes the work of Claude Bremond (1929-2021) , Algirdas Julien Greimas (1917-1992), Tzvetan Todorov(1939- 2017), Roland Barthes (1915-1990) and Gérard Genette (1930-2018)" (10).

Structuralism was a very influential movement that led to developments in many areas and sciences such as "philosophy", "history" and most importantly "literary criticism". It is concerned with examining a variety of texts to come to a full understanding of their underneath "structure". Structuralism investigates the components of different types of systems. It is objective in the sense that it sees texts as compositions impersonally created not subjective writings. Structuralism scientifically tries to examine a text and study its structure. It relates to notions such as "center" and structurality. It maintains that each structure starts from a center. Structuralism rejects the claim that literature represents reality. Furthermore, Structuralism totally and drastically objects to "humanistic" criticism ("Structuralism: Off-Shoots and Major Contributors", Kanchan Vohra, *passim*).

Structuralism is apparently "scientific" and "objective" and it pinpoints, highlights and makes use of systems. It relates to various fields such as "Linguistics", "anthropology", and many others. The role of structuralists is simply to encourage readers to deeply and continually study "literary works" and relate them to culture and society (*A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature, Fifth Edition*, Wilfred L. Guerin et al, *passim*).

Another definition of structuralism was introduced by Katie Wales (1946-) stating that it is "an intellectual discipline which gradually developed momentum" and that it " is concerned with structure(s): of language and other systems of knowledge and cultural behaviour" (Wales 396). Structuralism as tremendously influenced by a group of French scholars and intellectuals such as Claude Levi-Strauss, Michel Foucault, Roland Barthes and by the ideas of the renowned figure Ferdinand de Saussure (Wales 396).

Jonathan Culler (1944-) sees that giving a thorough definition of structuralism is problematic and controversial. He states "One cannot define structuralism by examining how the word has been used; that would lead only to despair" (3). He goes on stating that "To call oneself a structuralist was always a polemical gesture, a way of attracting attention and associating oneself with others whose work was of moment..." (3).

Structural interpretations and analyses cannot be based on enthusiasms or haphazard plans. Structure is above mere relations between different components. Furthermore, structuralism pertains to different movements such as "Determinism", "Functionalism" and "Fatalism" ("Structuralism", Javad B and Masoud JN, *passim*).

It is worth mentioning that the term structuralism entered into the domain of linguistics due to the efforts of Roman Jakobson (1896- 1982). W. Keith Percival (1930-2020) states that the concept "was introduced into linguistics by Roman Jakobson in the early days of the Linguistic Circle of Prague, founded in 1926" (236).

Structuralism provides the raw material to other schools of criticism such as Post-structuralism. Post-structuralism, for instance carries on the mission of structuralism and tries to reach a better understanding of language, Post-structuralism differs from Structuralism in that it believes in the importance of context to come to a better understanding to language ("*Structuralism, post-Structuralism, and the Library: De Saussure and Foucault*", Gary P. Radford and Marie L. Radford, *passim*).

Herman agrees stating that "both structuralism and poststructuralism have developed ideas of broad relevance for the study of the novel" and that they "they evolved from a common heritage of concepts" especially "Saussurean language theory" (805). However, they both "rely on different analytic procedures and set themselves contrasting investigative goals" (805).

Peter Caws (1931-2020) mentions Claude Levi-Strauss's criticism of the French structuralism stating that the tendency to classify, categorize and

imprudently build unstudied systems is a characteristic of simple and uneducated people (para1).

Seymour Chatman (1928-2015) sees the relationship between structuralism and narratology stating that, each narrative is composed of a number of ingredients including what might be called “histoire” or story, “the existents” and the “discourse” (19). Chatman sees that story is “the what” and the discourse is “the how” (19).

It is worth mentioning that one of the great thinkers in this field is Claude Levi-Strauss who bases his understanding of structuralism upon the idea of binary opposition. Binary opposition maintains that our understanding of ideas depends on how they are opposed or contradicted (“Structuralism: Off-Shoots and Major Contributors”, Kanchan, *op. cit.*).

Percival states that the term structuralism was "never used by Ferdinand de Saussure himself and in general was not used by linguists at all until the late 1920s" (244). The term was "first attested in writings issuing from the “Linguistic Circle of Prague” (Cercle linguistique de Prague), founded by Vilém Mathesius (1882-1945) and Roman Jakobson in 1926" (244).

Concerning the application of structuralism to literature, scholars speak of and regularly study the narrative structure. David Lodge (1935-) states that narrative structure is "like the framework of girders that holds up a modern high-rise building: you can't see it, but it determines the edifice's shape and character" (216).

Percival states that the words "structure" and "structural", which were used by Jakobson, express the linguists' tendency to borrow expressions from biology and "natural sciences" and apply them to literature and literary criticism (248).

Christopher Norris (1947-) highlights Barthes’s viewpoint about Structuralism that it is also seen as a kind of "master-code or analytic discourse" – (8-9). Norris goes on stating that this interpretation "really comes down to the belief in structuralist method as a discourse able to master and explain all the varieties of language and culture" (8-9)

The structure of a narrative can be best described as a group of associations between components of a given story. Studying the structure is highly important to narratologists. Furthermore, having the so called “narrative competence” helps in identifying stories and tales and highlighting their parts which in turn helps in assessing and evaluating stories (*Encyclopedia of the Novel*, Katherine Saunders Nash, *passim*).

Structuralists whose main concern is narratology build their theories upon the ideas of Ferdinand de Saussure who differentiates between *langue* and *parole* ("Narrative Theory: A Shift Towards Reader's Response", Javad Momeni and Bahareh Jalali Farahani, *passim*).

Though structuralism proved a very beneficial theory in a number of areas, it has also its limitations. Structuralism has led to a general trend of investigating stories in isolation to their contexts. This resulted in a complete indifference to the possible links that can be configured or discovered among many kinds of stories produced in the same contexts or circumstances ("Narrative Analysis in Linguistic Research", Julio C. Gimenez, *passim*).

Narrative Grammar:

The first category of narratological theories studied and visited by Lodge is that bulk concerned with narrative grammar or, in Lodge's words, "the underlying system of rules and possibilities of which any narrative *parole* (text) is the realization" (59). Lodge mentions a lot of theories pertaining to narrative grammar. However, he is particularly interested in Greimas's theory or "The Actantial Model." Lodge also pays homage to and elaborates on Roland Barthes's theory of Nuclei and catalyzers.

The Actantial model is highly descriptive of characters in a work of art or rather their functionality. There have been a lot of trials to describe characters in a work of art. Some scholars such as Phelan and Rabinowitz suggest that "characters are only words on paper, brushstrokes on canvas, images on celluloid, and so forth" (111). They go on stating that narratologists also believe that a character is "a set of predicates grouped under a proper name that performs one or more plot functions" (111). They believe that "Characters do resemble possible people, they are artificial constructs that perform various functions in the progression, and they can function to convey the political, philosophical, or ethical issues being taken up by the narrative" (Phelan and Rabinowitz 111).

Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan (1942-) believes that Propp "subordinates characters to 'spheres of action'" (34). Uri Margolin (1942-) believes that the term "refers to a storyworld participant, i.e., any individual or unified group occurring in a drama or work of narrative fiction" (52-53). Margolin, also, sketches out the classification of different character theories stating that theories of characterization are classified majorly into two types "mimetic" or "non-mimetic" (52-53). The first type shows that characters are like human beings while the second type reduces a character to a theme or text-based construction (Margolin 52-53).

Margolin believes that approaches to study character are “different in their points of departure”; but “they reveal significant complementarity, and sometimes even convergence, providing jointly a fairly rich theory of character” (52-53).

A character in a given work of art isn't true for it has no life, no matter how skillful the author is in portraying it. A character can be a very simple group of expression or “words” used to state a certain viewpoint. Before being judged, a character must be seen in relation to other elements in a story (*Understanding the Elements of Literature Its Forms, Techniques and Cultural Conventions*, Richard Taylor, *passim*).

Meike Bal (1946-) believes that “Characters resemble people” and that they are “fabricated creatures made up from fantasy, imitation, memory” (105). He goes on stating that a character in a work of art “has no real psyche, personality, ideology, or competence to act, but it does possess characteristics that make readers assume they do and that make psychological and ideological descriptions possible” (105)

Other scholars like Herman and Vervaeck believe in the necessity of studying the way characters are represented in a story (67). They believe that to reveal how characters are embodied in a work of art, there must be certain “characteristics” for doing this (67).

About the functions of characters in a work of art, Bal says that characters “have been allotted, each of them functions in a different way with respect to the reader” (105). Bal also believes that the reader “gets to know them more or less than other characters, finds them more or less appealing, and identifies more or less easily with them” (105).

Bal talks about a kind of character-effect that “occurs when the resemblance between human beings and fabricated figures is so strong that we forget the fundamental difference : we even go so far as to identify with the character, to cry, to laugh, and to search for or with it ...” (105).

Some scholars refuted the idea that characters are to be a part of a restrictive theory believing that characters are multidimensional and intricate. Chatman describes characters believing that their traits are “numerous” and that they “cannot be discovered by ramifying dichotomies; forcing the issue only destroys the uniqueness of characters' identities” (112). Chatman also believes that “What gives the modern fictional character the particular kind of illusion acceptable to modern taste is precisely the heterogeneity or even scatter in his personality” (112).

Some scholars failed in formulating a substantial and adequate theory about characters. Kenan says that character “is pronounced 'dead' by

many modern writers” (30). Kenan also believes that “Structuralists can hardly accommodate character within their theories, because of their commitment to an ideology which 'decentres' man and runs counter to the notions of individuality and psychological depth” (30).

Kenan pronounces the death of character by the hands of modern fiction and poses a number of questions,

But is character as 'dead' as all that? Do the new views dispense with it altogether, or do they only dismantle a certain traditional concept of it? Can the changing notions be seen as nevertheless leaving some constitutive characteristics recognizable? (31)

Interest in characterization is so wide that even some of the scholars were interested in studying the effect of the characters' proper names believing that a proper name “is a kind of ultimate residence of personality, not a quality but a locus of qualities, the narrative-noun that is endowed with but never exhausted by the qualities, the narrative-adjectives” (Chatman 131). Such an interest may relate to Aristotle's concept of “homoios” (131). An example of this can be found in Charles Dickens novels, especially his novel *Great Expectations*. Miss Havisham is a desperate lady who is forsaken by her fiancé. She represents disappointment and revenge.

The Theory of Greimas:

This chapter will look into the theory of Greimas and see how it is comparable to Aristotle's. So, what is an actant? An actant is " a term used by Greimas to describe the paired roles he argued as common to all stories: subject/object, sender/ receiver, helper/opponent" (Cuddon 9). What about the theory itself?

This theory is significantly practical in the sense that it is used in many areas. It maintains that there are six functions of a character: the giver, the receiver, the subject, the object, the helper and the opponent (“Narrative: Linguistic and Structural Theories”, M. Toolan, *passim*).

Herman and Vervaeck offer a very useful and illustrative discussion of such a model. They state that Greimas's model is more famous than the model introduced by Bremond (52-53). Greimas's models consist of six items, roles, or functions. The subject craves for reaching a certain object. The sender begins action and the helper who aids the subject to reach the object. The agent who goes against the subject is the opponent (Herman and Vervaeck 52-53).

Greimas's theory is based on multiple theories. Such theories include “the theory of opposition”, “the syntactical functioning of discourse”, and

the theory of “*dramatis personae*”. His theory is a serious trial to bring together Levi-Strauss’s and Propp’s models (*From Aristotle to Gabriel: A Summary of the Narratology Literature for Story Technologies*, Joanna Kwait, *passim*).

How can Greimas's theory be compared to Aristotle? What is Aristotle's possible impact on the Actantial model? Aristotle was the first to refer to the dynamicity of characters in a work of art. Kenan states that Aristotle “believed characters to be necessary only as 'agents' or 'performers' of the action (1951, p. 34), a view shared by formalists and structuralists of our own century, though for different reasons” (34). He says that characters are “men in action.” Who are men in action? What could be the possible roles taken by men or character to create and aggravate action. Greimas gives the answer. He has dilated and elaborated on this phrase- “men in action”. The action is initiated and developed through the interplay of the roles suggested by Greimas. The Sender initiates action, and the receiver benefits from action. The helper aids in fulfilling action. The subject wants to join with the object. All roles perfect action. Aristotle's phrase have been expounded and worked on by Greimas.

Aristotle believes that characters are either venerable or lower, and their actions mirror this nature. Such a belief of Aristotle corresponds with the diversified functions proposed by Greimas.

One more point worth considering is Aristotle's sub-ordination of character which goes hand in hand with Greimas's term actant- a term which highlights the importance of action. Kennan states that Greimas believes in “the subordination of characters by calling them 'actants'” (34). Such a belief is based on the view that characters are “submitting to an act” (34). In his definition of tragedy, he insists that it is the “imitation of an action”, so he gives primacy and supremacy to action. Characters are of minor importance. They are only defined in relation to action. They lose importance if taken out of action. Greimas deeply believes in this and defines characters as related to action whether they begin action or hinder action. They may be the center of action and largely affect action or they may slightly affect action. Characters are in action. Action is the sphere in which various characters perform and display their potential. Characters pull and push between two poles- that of accomplishing action and that of hindering it. Greimas's model reflects conflict and engagement.

Greimas's theory builds on one phrase suggested by Aristotle that is men in action. Though Aristotle never talked about the possible roles that can be taken by different characters in a given narrative, Greimas was rather

inspired by that action and by the possible functions of characters in a work of art.

Barthes's theory:

We now move to Barthes's theory of Nuclei and catalyzers- a theory which makes difference between significant and insignificant points in a storyline. It is a theory which offers a description to the pivotal and central stages in a story line and the points that lead to the development of action. It defines action and the axis of action. It asserts and stems from the idea of sequentiality.

Functions and indices can be classified. Functions, for example, can be classified into nuclei and catalyzers. Nuclei are successive and "consequential"; catalyzers are only successive. If a nucleus is omitted, the story will change. If a catalyst is omitted, on the other hand, the narration itself changes. Indices can be classified into indices' proper and bits of information. Of all the previously mentioned categories, nuclei are the most important (*From Aristotle to Gabriel: A Summary of the Narratology Literature for Story Technologies*, Kwait, *op.cit.*).

Barthes states that nuclei and catalyzers are both "primary categories" which are used to classify and understand units of action in a story (Barthes10). He goes on stating that catalyzers are "expansions, in relation to the nuclei", nuclei, on the other hand, are "governed by a system of logic, they are at once necessary and self sufficient..." (Barthes10).

Seymour Chatman (1928-2015) describes events in a story line stating that events in a storyline "have not only logic of connection, but logic of hierarchy" (53). He goes on stating that, in a story, the main events "are part of the chain or armature of contingency" and they are different from insignificant and "minor" events (53).

Nuclei reflect highly critical points in the action of the story. Catalyzers are fillers greatly depending on nuclei. Catalyzers are the "other accompanying actions" that help furthering the action in a storyline. Nuclei provide the bases upon which the story is built ("Narrative: Linguistic and Structural Theories", Toolan, *op.cit.*).

When we come to consider Aristotle's definition of the stages of a given plot, we realize the importance of a beginning, middle and an end. Aristotle highlights the importance of those points in a certain storyline. Barthes's theory, if looked upon carefully, can be considered a natural development to Aristotle's ideas. Barthes's only addition is that certain events or points in a narrative trigger action and some others are the pivotal. Aristotle highlights the pivotal points or the highpoints in a storyline.

However, his theory considerably lacks the indication that certain events entice, further, and move action. Barthes's theory is a reshaping of Aristotelian ideas.

It is worth mentioning that Barthes's interest in the narrative goes far more than this. Barthes's model composed of three notions "narration", "actions" and "units". Barthes was greatly influenced by the works of Todorov, Greimas, Propp, and Bremond (*From Aristotle to Gabriel: A Summary of the Narratology Literature for Story Technologies*, Kwit, *op.cit.*)

Barthes, though systematic and categorical, realizes the limitations of structuralism. Norris states that Barthes "remains susceptible as ever to the pleasures of system and method, the old fascination with structure as a totalizing order of thought" (10). Norris believes that Barthes's uncertainty about structure relates to his deep belief that "The dream of total intelligibility, like 'structure' in its metalinguistic sense, belongs (he implies) to a stage of thinking that is self-blinded by its own conceptual metaphors" (10).

Fictional Representation:

Another phenomenon that took the interest of Lodge is fictional representation. Lodge is specifically interested in the Russian Formalists distinction between *Fabula* and *Sjuzet*. There has been a grand interest through the years about the concept of plot and the difference between it and the story. What is a plot? What is a story? What's *Fabula*? What's *sjuzet*?

Let's begin by studying the distinction between *fabula* and *sjuzet* and their relation to narrative structure. The structure of the story comprises both the "story" or *fabula* and the "discourse" or "*sjuzhet*" (*Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, Patrick O'Neil, *passim*).

The introduction of the concepts of *fabula*, "the story in simple temporal and chronological sequence" and *sjuzhet* "its artistic presentation in narrative" has been the responsibility of Russian Formalists (Grethlein 158). However, the French literary theorist Gerard Genette has crystalized and refined the work of Russian Formalists by introducing three areas of difference between the terms- tense "the shaping of time through order, duration and frequency"; mood, "the selection of information and its presentation through focalization" ; and voice, "the narratorial instance" (Grethlein158).

Fabula and *sjuzhet* are two terms which have not occurred on the spur of the moment. Both formulate the tenants of a narratorial theory that

has been worked on by many different scholars and critics over the years. *Sjuzhet*, a notion generally used by “Russian Formalists”, means the presentation of the story itself making use of the chronological order (*Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, Ann Banfield, *passim*).

As for *sjuzhet*, Wales believes that it was “introduced into narrative theory by the Russian formalists in the 1920s” and that it refers to “the surface level with the actual sequence of events as narrated, with all the flashbacks, anticipations, and gaps” (385). Wales also refers to *fabula* stating that it represents “the abstracted chronological or logical possible ordering of the events” and therefore, *fabula* can be deduced from *sjuzhet* (385). *Sjuzet* reflects a narrative level that has been modified more than once. *Fabula* is the raw material of *sjuzhet*.

The *sjuzhet* reflect the manner with which the story is displayed. The *sjuzhet* reflects a special sequence of events (Narrative Theory Core Concepts and Critical Debates, Robyn Warhol, *passim*).

Genette is one of the most influential critics whose critical works and writings are really and truly universal. His theory in narratology is ubiquitous and distinctive (“Gerard Genette’s Evolving Narrative *Poetics*”, John Pier, *passim*).

Genette was the first to talk about levels of narrative. Monika Fludernike (1957-) states that Genette differentiates between *récit*, narration and *histoire* (2). *Récit* and narration are very much related and are both called “the narrative discourse” (2). Both the *récit* and narration help in producing the story or *histoire* (Fludernike 2).

Fludernike believes that the categories suggested by Genette are the result of a study to Latin grammar and the inflections of verbs (89). Verbs adjusted according to “voice”, “mood” and “tense” (89). Narrative classifications start from studying such grammatical functions (Fludernike 89).

Such categories help in understanding the difference between *fabula* and *sjuzhet*. Genette also was interested to study the relationship between narrative and discourse. Fludernike states Genette’s critical writings “focused almost entirely on the narrative discourse of the novel” and were directed “to create a new terminological framework that was constructed in accordance with strict, binary principles” (11).

One of the phenomena that were studied by Genette is temporal duality, which he defined as “the opposition between *erzahlte Zeit* (story time) and *Erzahlzeit* (narrative time)” (33). He also believed it to be a common trait in both “cinematic” and “oral” narrative (33).

In his article, Lodge pays a special homage to the Genette's subdivisions of *temps* or time, namely, order, duration and frequency. Order simply refers to the temporal organization of events in a work of art. In *fabula*, the order is certainly chronological. In *sjuzhet*, following chronological order is not needed. Duration simply means the span of time in which events occur in *fabula* and how it is different from that of *sjuzhet*. Genette states that such a category is a little bit "trickier" because "no one can measure the duration of a narrative" (86).

The third category explained by Genette is frequency which refers to the number of times an event occurs in the *fabula* and the number of times it occurs in *sjuzhet*. Such a category is very important and vital in understanding the relation between *fabula* and *sjuzhet*. This category is not mentioned by many critics and theorists and can be said to be Genette's distinguished and great addition to the narrative theory. Genette states that such category "has been very little studied by -critics and theoreticians of the novel" and believes it to be "one of the main aspects of narrative temporality" (113).

Seen in the light of the above mentioned categories, the difference between *fabula* and *sjuzhet* is rather noticeable. Genette's achievements in the field have been of utmost importance and of great significance to the narrative theory.

It is worth noticing that the pair *fabula/sjuzhet* is a natural development to the traditional pair story and plot. Manfred Pfister (1943-) gives a formal definition of story stating that it is "as something that requires the three following ingredients: one or more human or anthropomorphic subjects, a temporal dimension indicating the passing of time and a spatial dimension giving a sense of space" (196). He, also, believes that it "provides the foundation underlying not only every dramatic text, but also every narrative" (196). Herman and Vervaeck believe that the well-known term story is now exchanged with or rather equated with *fabula*, "The Russian formalists used the term *fabula* for this chronological sequence (story) and *sjuzhet* for the specific way in which it was presented in the text" (46).

It is worth telling that the plot has been always equated with "*sjuzhet*". The plot or *sjuzhet* is best understood as an act of logical appreciation or intellectual effort deeply influencing the readers the more they go on with the story and come to acknowledge the interaction between the real world and imaginary world (*Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, Hilary P. Dannenberg, *passim*).

The distinction between *fabula* and *sjuzhet* is so near to the distinction between story and plot. Decades before, E. F. Forster presented the difference between both concepts stating that a plot justifies a story or a certain sequencing of events. The concept of plot is much celebrated and has much weight in the narrative theory. It is usually indefinable and refers to a wide range of things or notions. Furthermore, it is believed that a lot of explanations of plot relate it to story or mistakenly use it to refer to the story itself (*Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, Dannenberg, *op.cit.*).

However, Chatman believes that plot is a vital element in a narrative and states that “A narrative without a plot is a logical impossibility” (48). Temporal order plays a significant role in deciding upon the type of narrative, narrative of resolution or revelation, stating that “a strong sense of temporal order is more significant in resolved than in revealed plots” (48). Chatman additionally states that while narratives of resolution shows “a sense of problem-solving”, revelatory narratives are “strongly character-oriented, concerned with the infinite detailing of existents, as events are reduced to a relative/ly minor, illustrative role” (48).

Nonetheless, some scholars believe that the term plot has grown to be a little bit problematic and that it seems that there are more general terms or concepts to which the plot belongs and constitutes a part (177).

The notion of plot seems to be insufficient to describe all “plot-driven compositions”. Plot can be only one type of “narrative sequencing” which greatly and variedly interacts with other types of progression or sequencing. A perfect narrative sequence should, therefore, include more than one strategy or technique of progression and should not be plain or unsophisticated. It is necessary for a given plot to maintain a degree of complexity to maintain the readers’ interest of the story (*Narrative Theory Core Concepts and Critical Debates*, Warhol, *op.cit.*).

The insufficiency of the notion of the plot to describe all narrative dynamics has been a real problem. In addition, the notions of “narrative dynamism” and “progression” should not be taken carelessly or indiscreetly but examined comprehensively and broadly (“Narrative Dynamics and Narrative Theory”, Richard Walsh, *passim*).

However, it is worth noticing that progression and sequencing play an important role in the differentiation between story and plot. Marie-Laure Ryan (1946-) defines sequencing believing that it is “conceived as an order inherent to the events of a story or as the order in which these events are presented by discourse” and that “narrative sequence is a basically linear

phenomenon” (176). Ryan also notices that “In contemporary literary theory, linearity is generally regarded with contempt, because its one-dimensionality suggests lack of complexity, and complexity tends to be praised as an inherently desirable property of artistic texts” (176). It can be implied then that the more straight-lined a plot is, the more tedious it becomes. It can be inferred that intricacy is very much preferred in the composition of plots.

Culler mentions Barthes’s opinion about sequences of action stating that he believes that they “constitute the armature of the readable or intelligible text” and “provide an order which is both sequential and logical and thus serve as one of the preferred objects of structural analysis” (239). Culler goes on with Barthes’s viewpoint, “A theory of plot structure ought to provide a representation of readers’ abilities to identify plots, to compare them and to grasp their structure” (239).

There are a number of logical and rational ways to order and arrange incidents in a story. One way is “the logical sequence” which resembles the chronological order but differs in that it depends in highlighting the theme or the issue of the story. Stories can also be structured in episodes. Stories can be simple allegories or myths. All such types of plot sequences confirm the idea that plot is vulnerable to change and that plot refers to a narratorial level different from that of a story which is considered the raw material of narratorial progression. Finally, the chronological order is the most important and famous of all kinds of sequencing. It is the usual and ordinary way of telling stories. Nonetheless, a story is not constantly a definite “record” of a series of happenings. It can be “fictionalized” fashioned marvelously by the author (*Understanding The Elements of Literature: Its Forms, Techniques and Cultural Conventions*, Taylor, *op.cit.*).

Lodge realizes that following chronology is obsolete and outmoded and states that such way of telling a story is “equally favoured by tribal bards and parents at bedtime” (80). However, he mentions a very vital point which is the ancients’ interest in “deviating from chronological order” and states that “The classical epic began in *médias res*, in the midst of the story” example of which is the “Odyssey” (80).

Lodge talks about time shift as one of the preferred techniques in raising the interest of the readers, “Through time-shift, narrative avoids presenting life as just one damn thing after another, and allows us to make connections of causality and irony between widely separated events” (80). Therefore, a chronological sequence is simple, rudimentary and basic. It

essentially implies a lack of sophistication. Thus, story is the raw material of plot.

In order to fully understand the meaning of a story, Sylvie Patron (1969-) suggests turning to Genette's *Narrative Discourse* (1972) in which he puts it in comparison with the term narrative. The story is the "signified" or "narrative content" and the narrative is the "signifier" or "statement" (120).

Herman and Vervaeck believe that "Just like any deep structure, the story is an abstract construct that the reader has to derive from the concrete text" (45).

Studying and understanding the difference between *fabula* and *sjuzhet* may have been one of the reasons behind the emergence of the anti-story and some other concepts of post-modernism such as fragmentation and anachrony. Chatman offers a comparison between classical narratives and modern narrative, "If the classical narrative is a network ... of kernels affording avenues of choice only one of which is possible, the antistory may be defined as an attack on this convention which treats all choices as equally valid" (53). Anti-mimetic stories abstain from adhering to the known traditions of "storytelling". An ordinary story naturally has a speaker, characters and a series of happenings or actions. An anti-mimetic story, on the other hand, gets rid of these restrictions (*Narrative Theory Core Concepts and Critical Debates*, Brian Richardson, *passim*)

Peter Huhn (1939-) Studying sequence and narrative progression has led also to the emergence of the term non-event which describes "the failure of an (expected) event to occur and the non-eventfulness of a particular change" (40).

Aristotle and the Moderns:

What about Aristotle's *Poetics*? Is there any reference to the modern pair *fabula/sjuzhet* in the Aristotelian theory? Pfister believes that the concept of story of *fabula* dates back to Aristotle,

Ever since Aristotle's *Poetics* (chs. 6 and 14) — that is, from the very beginnings of dramatic theory - critics have agreed unanimously that the macrostructure of every dramatic text is founded on a story, though of course the concept of what actually constitutes a story has given rise to a whole range of different interpretations varying considerably in precision and breadth. (196)

Aristotle talked about plot. However, his definition of plot is so near that of a story. Right from the beginning of his *Poetics*, Aristotle believes that there should be an inquiry about "the structure of the plot as requisite to

a good poem” (3). He also believes that “The Plot, then, is the first principle, and, as it were, the soul of a tragedy” (9). Aristotle then defines plot, stating that “the Plot is the imitation of the action: for by plot I here mean the arrangement of the incidents” (8). Aristotle believes that each plot is composed of certain parts and that if any part is misplaced the whole will be badly and drastically affected. Thus, Aristotle prefers following chronology or the chronological order of events when constructing a play. Though, beginning in the middle of the plot or *medias res* was well-known in classical narratology, Aristotle never approved of it.

Aristotle may have affected in the moderns by giving the idea that story should be chronological, and that one type plot construction might be the chronological order. Though there is no knowledge or a denial of the *szuzhet* in the Aristotelian *Poetics*, the *Poetics* provided the base on which most modern theories are built.

Like Aristotle, some modern critics believe that a well-made plot should follow a certain schemata and should have certain identifiable parts. In the 18th century, there appeared a kind of drama called “the well-made” play. It follows a certain formatting exactly like “the classical models. Such plays have an introduction, rising actions, climax, and falling actions. Such plays allowed for organizing the topic or the issue of the story into recognizable and coherent parts (*Understanding the Elements of Literature: Its Forms, Techniques and Cultural Conventions*, Taylor, *op.cit.*).

Linguistic Mediation:

The last phenomenon illustrated by Lodge in his article is Rhetorical analysis of linguistics mediation. Lodge states “The underlying aim of this criticism was to demonstrate that what looked like redundant or random detail in realistic fiction was in fact functional, contributing to a pattern of motives with expressive and thematic significance” (63). One of the distinguished and pioneering figures in this area is Roman Jakobson.

About Jakobson, Richard Bradford (1932-2002) states that he is “Formalist, structural linguist, a man who played a crucial part in bridge-building between the US and European sciences of the sign” (13). Bradford elaborates on the supremacy of Jakobson stating that he once said about himself “I am a linguist and hold nothing that has to do with language to be alien to me” (4).

About Jacobson’s achievements, Bradford says that he “played a major role in the founding of the Prague Linguistic Circle in 1926, a group which has had a significant influence upon European, primarily French, structuralism of the post-Second World War years and upon Anglo-

American linguistics” (2). Bradford mentions that his works include a substantial and seminal “a theory of phonology” and his “theories of literary history” (2)

The work of Roman Jakobson is very much influential especially in the areas of Formalism and Structuralism. He initiated the so-called “Moscow Linguistic Circle” in addition to “Prague Linguistic Circle” (*Literary Criticism from Plato to the Present: An Introduction*, M. A. R. Habib, *passim*).

Bradford mentions how Jacobson’s education has greatly influenced his career, “In 1914 he entered the historico-philological faculty at the University of Moscow, and the following year the 19-year-old Jakobson with six other students founded the *Moskovskij Lingvističeskij Kruzok*, the Moscow Linguistic Circle” (1)

His Theory:

Jakobson’s theory is concerned with the analysis of metaphor and metonymy. It maintains that all language has two poles- metaphor and metonymy. Any instance of language relates to those two “semantic” phenomena. Metaphor is determined by on similarity. Metonymy relates to “contiguity”. Metaphor and metonymy sometimes greatly interconnect. However, in different instances, usually one of them is given prevalence. Furthermore, there is a kind of rivalry between both notions (*Literary Criticism from Plato to the Present: An Introduction*, Habib, *op.cit.*).

All language system according to Jakobson’s theory builds upon the two notions, metaphor and metonymy. Sometimes, in a given portion of language, one process may reveal more than another. But what is metaphor? What is metonymy?

L. David Ritchie (1943-) believes that “Metaphor” has been variously defined in terms of substituting one word for another word with an apparently different meaning, comparing one idea to another, or creating an implicit analogy or simile”(4). Still, he believes that “The question “what is a metaphor?” is not easy to answer” and that the term may refer at one extreme to “eloquent and colorful literary metaphors” (3).

Katie Wales (1946-) believes that metaphor “has sometimes been used as a very general label for different kinds of figurative meaning or verbal transference, including metonymy and synecdoche” (265). Wales continues illustrating the meaning of metaphor stating that “When words are used with metaphoric senses, one field or domain of reference is carried over or mapped onto another on the basis of some perceived similarity between the two fields. . .” (265).

Metaphor can be described as a kind of irregularity, or abnormal use of language. Many scholars in philosophy believed that it is better for metaphor to be only used in literature since it can cause a kind of vagueness or negatively affect rational and logical thinking. Nonetheless, it has been later proved that metaphor cannot be restricted to literature because it is truly an inevitable part of language (*The Language of Metaphors*, Andrew Goatly, *passim*).

Cuddon states that metaphor is “A figure of speech in which one thing is described in terms of another” (432-433). Gerard J. Steen (1957-) believes that a metaphor “may be theoretically defined as a matter of conceptual structure, [which] works its wonders in language, communication, or thought” and that “it is processed via lexical disambiguation” (60). Steen also believes that metaphor can be “a matter of backstage cognition, automatically but unconsciously utilizing entrenched cross-domain mappings which have been acquired during people’s cognitive and linguistic development” (60).

Gerard J. Steen (1957-) also believes that a metaphor “is defined as a mapping across conceptual domains” (49). This definition was conceived “as the most productive and best embedded theoretical definition of metaphor” because it helps “to study metaphor in thought, language, and communication in a range of semiotic, psychological and even social approaches” (49-50).

After discussing metaphor, now the researcher turns to consider the meaning of metonymy. Wales believes that it is “a rhetorical figure or trope by which the name of a referent is replaced by the name of an attribute” and that “In semiotic terms, metonymy is an indexical sign: there is a directly or logically contiguous relationship between the substituted word and its referent” (267-268). Some scholars believe that, “Metonymy provides foundations on which the metaphorical edifice is built” (Goatly 55).

Rene Dirven (1932-2016) believes that Jakobson “was convinced that the metaphoric and the metonymic are the two fundamental poles or manifestations of human behaviour, as he called it” (4). Dirven goes on elaborating on Jacobson’s interest in the metaphoric and the metonymic stating that he preferred “opposing metaphor and metonymy and, in fact, he did not much bother about the idea of a continuum, on which metonymy and metaphor can be supposed to meet and to develop” (4).

Bradford believes that “Jakobson’s work on metonymy and metaphor is at its most detailed and intensive in his treatment, during the 1950s, of the linguistic disorders of aphasia” (8). He studied types of

aphasia in relation to language phenomena such as metaphor and metonymy.

Dirven elaborates on Jakobson's theory stating that

The metaphoric is based upon substitution and similarity, the metonymic upon predication, contexture and contiguity. These two ways of thought are linked, though not in this paper, but in several other papers of his collected works, to the paradigmatic and the syntagmatic axes of linguistic expressions. (41)

Dirven also thinks that the metaphoric and metonymic poles not only found in language but in other disciplines such as “ language impairments, especially aphasia, child language acquisition, literature (similarity in poetry, contiguity in the novel), Freud's psycho-analysis, literary and art schools, the history of painting and art movements, folklore such as folk tales and wedding songs” (41).

Bradford states that, “The bipolar opposition between metaphor and metonymy is crucial to our understanding of Jakobson's notion of language and literature as at once co-dependent and autonomous sign systems” (6). Jakobson's study to metaphor and metonymy goes along his study of types of aphasia. Since metaphor is based on similarity and metonymy is based on contiguity, Jakobson studies types of aphasia that is based on a disorder in recognizing similarity and contiguity. Bradford states that, “In a 1963 paper called ‘A Linguistic Classification of Aphasic Impairments’ Jakobson extended his distinction between similarity and contiguity disorder into the classification of encoding and decoding impairments” (12).

Aristotle:

In *Poetics*, Aristotle assigns a considerable portion for studying diction and language. Aristotle studied a lot of linguistic phenomena two of which are metaphor and metonymy. Aristotle defined metaphor as “the application of an alien name by transference either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or by analogy, that is, proportion” (23). Wales believes that “Aristotle in his *Poetics* was more analytical, seeing metaphor as a trope based on similitude; and many other critics since have noted an apparent implied relationship with simile” (265).

Jakobson's work on metaphor was even more analytical. This is due to a general interest in metaphor and language. Steen says that “The new contemporary theory of metaphor offers an improved paradigm for research in which old answers receive new interpretations and novel questions can be posed” (28). Steen believes also that the new theory of metaphor holds that “Metaphor is not just a matter of language and thought, but also of

communication; and metaphor cannot just be approached from a linguistic (or more generally, semiotic) as well as a cognitive (or more adequately, psychological) perspective, but it also demands a social approach” (28)

Steen also believes that recent theories depend on the definition of metaphor (59). The term metaphor can be further developed since it can be studied from “either a semiotic, psychological, or social perspective (Steen 59).

About the theory of Jakobson, Kanchan says that the critical works of Roman Jakobson (1896-1982) show a great reliance on the idea of “binary oppositions” and that he insisted upon showing and demonstrating how opposed metaphor and metonymy are. Furthermore, Jakobson was interested to show how such a theory has different effects on the study of “realism” and “symbolism” (Kanchan 48).

Aristotle’s definition or rather identification of metaphor as a language-based phenomenon was modified by Jakobson’s theory which entails the cross-disciplinary nature of the concept. Aristotle’s conceptualization of metaphor has led to a better understanding of language and other domains and fields of study.

Conclusion

David Lodge’s narratology is comparable to Aristotle’s *Poetics*. Modern narratological theories are divided into three categories; theories concerned with narrative grammar; theories pertaining to fictional representation; and theories pertaining to linguistic mediation. Aristotle is compared to A. J. Greimas, Roland Barthes, Roman Jakobson, and the Russian Formalists.

Bibliography:

- Alber, Jan and Monika Fludernik. “Introduction”, *Postclassical Narratology Approaches and Analyses*, edited by Jan Alber and Monika Fludernik, The Ohio State University Press / Columbus, 2010.
- Aristotle. *The poetics of Aristotle by Aristotle*, A Translation By S. H. Butcher, *The Project Gutenberg*, 1974.
- Bal, Meike. *Introduction to the Theory of the Narrative*, University Of Toronto Press, Toronto Buffalo London, 2009.
- Banfield, Ann. “Sjuzhet”, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, edited by David Herman et al., Routledge, Taylor and Francis, London and New York, 2005.
- Barthes, Roland. *An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative*, *New Literary History*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Vol.

-
- 6, No. 2, On Narrative and Narratives. (Winter, 1975), pp. 237-272.
- Booth, Wayne C. "Chapter4: Resurrection of the Implied Author: Why Bother?", A companion to the Narrative Theory, edited By James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz, Blackwell Publishing, 2005.
- Bradford, Richard. Roman Jakobson Life, Language, Art, Routledge, London New York, 2005.
- Caws, Peter. "What Is Structuralism?", *Academia*, Vol. 35, #1, 1968. <<www.academia.edu/46458002/What_Is_Structuralism>>
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*, Cornell University Press / Ithaca and London, 1978
- Cuddon, J. A. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory: Fifth Edition*, Wiley Blackwell, 2013.
- Culler, Jonathan. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, linguistics and the study of literature*, Routledge London New York, 2006.
- Dannenberg, Hilary P. "Plot", *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, edited by David Herman et al., Routledge Taylor and Francis London and New York, 2005.
- Dirven, Rene. "Introduction", edited by Rene Dirven and Ralf Parings. *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*, Mouton de Gruyter Berlin · New York, 2003.
- Fludernike, Monika. *Introduction to Narratology*, Routledge, London and New York, 2009.
- Genette, Gerard. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay In Method*, Translated by Jane E. Lewin Foreword by Jonathan Culler, Cornell University Press Ithaca , New York, 1980.
- Gimenez, Julio C. "Narrative Analysis in Linguistic Research", *ResearchGate*, 2009, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235907354_Narrative_Analysis_in_Linguistic_Research , access date 4/7/2024
- Goatly, Andrew. *The Language of Metaphors*, Routledge, 2003.
- Grethlein, Jonas. "Philosophical and structuralist Narratologies- Worlds Apart?", *Narratology and Interpretation The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, edited by Jonas Grethlein and Antonios Rengakos, Walter de Gruyter • Berlin • New York, 2009.
-

-
- Habib, M. A. R. *Literary Criticism from Plato to the Present: An Introduction*, Wiley Black well John Wiley & Sons INC Publication, 2011.
- Herman, David. "Structuralism- Poststructuralism", *The Encyclopedia of the Novel*, edited by Peter Melville Logan ,Associate Editors: Olakunle George, Susan Hegeman, and Efram Kristal, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
- Herman, Luc and Bart Vervaeck. *Handbook of Narrative Analysis*, University of Nebraska Press Lincoln and London, 2001.
- Hühn, Peter. "The Eventfulness of Non-Events", *Narrative Sequence in Contemporary Narratology*, edited by Raphaël Baroni and Françoise Revaz, The Ohio State University Press · Columbus, 2016.
- Jakobson, Roman Jakobson. "The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles", edited by Rene Dirven and Ralf Parings. *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast*, Mouton de Gruyter Berlin · New York, 2003.
- Javad B and Masoud JN. "Structuralism", *Journal of Sociology and Criminology*, 2016.
- Kenan, Shlomith Rimmon. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, Routledge, London and New-York, no date.
- Kwait, Joanna. *From Aristotle to Gabriel: A Summary of the Narratology Literature for Story Technologies*, 2008
- Lodge, David. *The Art of Fiction*, Viking Penguin, U.S.A, 1992.
- Margolin, Uri. "Character", *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, edited by David Herman et al., Routledge Taylor and Francis London and New York, 2005.
- Meister, Jan Christoph *et, al.* "Introduction", *Narratology beyond Literary Criticism Mediality, Disciplinarity*, edited by Jan Christoph Meister et al., Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York, 2005.
- Momeni, Javad and Bahareh Jalali Farahani. "NARRATIVE THEORY: A SHIFT TOWARDS READER'S RESPONSE", *International Journal of Current Advanced Research* Vol 5, Issue 8, pp. 1146-1153, August 2016, <<www.researchgate.net/publication/271752963>>. Accessed 12/28/2022.
- Norris, Christopher. *Deconstruction Theory and Practice 3rd edition*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
-

-
- O’neill, Patrick. “Narrative Structure”, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, edited by David Herman et al., Routledge, Taylor and Francis, London and New York, 2005.
- Patron, Sylvie. *On the Epistemology of Narrative Theory: Narratology and Other Theories of Fictional Narrative*, Translated by Anne Marsella, University of Paris 7-Denis Didero, 2006.
- Percival, W. Keith. “Roman Jakobson and the Birth of Linguistic Structuralism”, *Sign Systems Studies*, *ResearchGate*, DOI:[10.12697/SSS.2011.39.1.09](https://doi.org/10.12697/SSS.2011.39.1.09) CC BY-NC-ND, <<www.researchgate.net/publication/291221146_Roman_Jakobs_on_and_the_birth_of_linguistic_structuralism>>
- Pfister, Manfred. *The Theory and Analysis of Drama*, Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Radford, Gary P. and Marie L. Radford. Structuralism, “Post-Structuralism, and the Library: De Saussure and Foucault”, *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 61 No. 1, 2005pp. 60-78q, 0418 DOI 10.1108/00220410510578014, 2004 <<www.researchgate.net/publication/235319554_Structuralism_post-structuralism_and_the_library_De_Saussure_and_Foucault>>. (ResearchGate)
- Richardson, Brian. “Antimimetic, Unnatural, and Postmodern Narrative Theory”, *Narrative Theory Core Concepts and Critical Debates*, edited by David Herman James Phelan Peter J. Rabinowitz Brian Richardson Robyn Warhol, The Ohio State University, 2012.
- Ritchie, L. David. *Metaphor*, Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure. “Sequence, Linearity, Spatiality, or: Why Be Afraid of Fixed Narrative Order?”, *Narrative Sequence in Contemporary Narratology*, edited by Raphaël Baroni and Françoise Revaz, The Ohio State University Press · Columbus, 2016.
- Steen, Gerard J. “The contemporary theory of metaphor — now new and improved!”, *Metaphor and Metonymy revisited beyond the Contemporary Theory of Metaphor Recent developments and applicatios*, John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2013.
- Taylor, Richard. *Understanding the Elements of Literature Its Forms, Techniques and Cultural Conventions*, The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1981.
-

-
- Toolan, M. "Narrative: Linguistic and Structural Theories", *ReseachGate*, 2006, DOI:10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00528-9, Date of access: 4/9/2021.
- Vohra, Kanchan. "Structuralism: Off-Shoots and Major Contributors", *International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science*, 2020.
- Wales, Katie. "Metaphor", *A Dictionary of Stylistics: Third Edition*, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2011.
- Wales, Katie. "Sjuzet", *A Dictionary of Stylistics: Third Edition*, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2011.
- Wales, Katie. "Structuralism", *A Dictionary of Stylistics: Third Edition*, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2011.
- Walsh, Richard. "Narrative Dynamics and Narrative Theory", Published by Penn State University Press, *Style*, Volume 55, Number 1, 2021, pp. 78-83.
- Warhol, Robyn. "Narrative Values, Aesthetic Values" , *Narrative Theory Core Concepts and Critical Debates*, edited by David Herman James Phelan Peter J. Rabinowitz Brian Richardson Robyn Warhol, The Ohio State University, 2012.
- Wilfred L. Guerin et al, *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature Fifth Edition*, Oxford University Press, 2005.