

## Real-world Generalizations in Conrad's Third-person Narratives

**Jeremy Hawthorn**

*Norwegian University of Science and Technology*

And Captain MacWhirr wrote home from the coast of China twelve times every year, desiring quaintly to be “remembered to the children,” and subscribing himself “your loving husband,” as calmly as if the words so long used by so many men were, apart from their shape, worn-out things, and of a faded meaning.

The China seas north and south are narrow seas. They are seas full of every-day, eloquent facts, such as islands, sand-banks, reefs, swift and changeable currents – tangled facts that nevertheless speak to a seaman in clear and definite language. Their speech appealed to Captain MacWhirr’s sense of realities so forcibly that he had given up his state-room below and practically lived all his days on the bridge of his ship, often having his meals sent up, and sleeping at night in the chart-room. (Conrad 1950, 15)

There is something cinematic – *avant la lettre* – in the narrative shifts in this short passage from Joseph Conrad’s “Typhoon.” The most obvious shift involves the movement from description of, and commentary on, the fictional character, Captain McWhirr, to generalizations about the (we presume, non-fictional) China seas, and back again to the captain. As in a film, the movement from single character to vast geographical area serves to emphasize the smallness of the individual. But the first two sentences of the second paragraph quoted do not abandon a concern with McWhirr; indeed, they serve to illuminate an aspect of his character quite different from what his regular letters home reveal about him. If in his domestic life he is predictable to the point (and beyond) of boring, incapable of imagining a reality different from the static one he takes as given in his letters, in his role as captain he is alert to the eloquent speech of tangled facts that warn of changes in a volatile and potentially deadly region of the physical world.

The narrator’s intimate knowledge of the captain’s epistolary habits (twelve letters a year), of the reiterated phrases in the letters, and – later on in the text – the private thoughts of different characters, clearly marks the presence of what critics used to call an omniscient narrator. By convention, readers treat such a narrator as “reliable” unless given a reason not to do so: we do not expect a narrator who has the power to read a character’s thoughts to lie to us, and neither do we expect that a narrator who demonstrates such a mind-reading capacity to be mistaken in what he or she witnesses in characters’ inner selves. Moreover, our confidence in the narrator’s trustworthiness in matters concerning reports on his or her characters has a tendency to carry over to the narrator’s comments on real-world matters. Narrative theorists have used the term “obstination” to indicate the reader’s tendency to continue to frame or respond to a passage in a consistent manner unless prompted by textual clues not to do so, and in the case of the passage in question there can be few if any readers who treat the opening two sentences of the second quoted paragraph as less reliable than those sentences preceding and succeeding

them. If the narrator knows everything about a character, then his or her reliability about confidently asserted matters of physical geography is likely to be taken as equally sound.

There are, however, narrators and narrators, and a reader's view of a narrator's reliability is not distinct from the same reader's view of the knowledge and intelligence of the author who creates the narrator. The concept of narrative (un)reliability is generally associated with the analytic distinction between (usually) personified narrators who can be trusted, and those who can not. In the latter case, the assumption is that the alert reader is meant to recognize that the views, reports, and values of a particular personified narrator are (or are not) to be trusted. My focus is on something different: it concerns the views, reports, and values of unpersonified narrators whose ability to perceive what characters are thinking, feeling and doing – even beyond what the characters themselves are capable of perceiving in some cases – gives their authority a status that is so unlike that enjoyed by any ordinary human being that a natural tendency has been to refer to it as godlike, as in most cultural traditions such omniscience is attributed only to a divine being.

Of late, the once-uncontroversial term “omniscient” has been objected to, and defended, on various grounds. As any English dictionary will confirm, the word means “all knowing” or possessed of unlimited knowledge – although some dictionaries allow “seeming to have” such knowledge as a legitimate use of the word. Literary critics and narrative theorists rarely support usages that involve such total knowledge. In his *Narrative Discourse* (1980), for example, Gérard Genette uses “nonfocalized narrator” to refer to “what English-language criticism calls the narrative with omniscient narrator” (Genette 1980, 188–9), “where the narrator knows more than the character, or more exactly *says* more than any of the characters knows” (189). This is hardly unlimited knowledge. Paul Dawson, in his *The Return of the Omniscient Narrator* (2013), provides a more comprehensive sense of the term when he turns his attention to certain recent works of fiction

which exhibit all the formal elements we typically associate with literary omniscience: an all-knowing authorial narrator who addresses the reader directly, offers intrusive commentary on the events being narrated, ranges freely across space and time, provides access to the consciousness of characters, and generally asserts a palpable presence within the fictional world. (Dawson 2013, 1)

For Dawson, the reach of an author's or a narrator's omniscience is not limited to the world of the fiction.

The overriding effect which the various formal elements of omniscient narration both enable, and are underpinned by, is that of a specific rhetorical performance of narrative authority. By this I mean the heterodiegetic narrator's authority to pass judgment on the fictional world, and the authoritative resonance of these judgments in the extradiegetic or public world of the reader. Essential to this authority is a coherent narrative persona who serves as a proxy for the author.

(54)

Even this does not gather in the example of the China seas, north and south, however, because in the passage with which I opened this essay there is more than an authorial judgement on the fictional world that merely “resonates” in the reader’s extradiegetic or public world. There is, surely, no reader who assumes that the China seas in this passage exist only in the world of the fiction and not in the extra-fictional world of author and reader. Conrad’s narrator’s comment on the China seas does not just resonate on an aspect of the geography of the extra-fictional world; surely for most readers it refers directly to these non-fictional seas.

This is not to say that Conrad’s third-person narrators typically lay claim to total knowledge; indeed, his so-called omniscient narrators more often than not confess to ignorance about certain things – witness the very first sentence of *Lord Jim* in which the word “perhaps” admits to an uncertainty about something as simple and uncomplicated as Jim’s height. But if there are some things that Conrad’s third-person narrators are prepared to admit that they do not know, they are often more than willing to comment not just on the fictional world and its inhabitants, but on the world outside the fiction. Dawson’s proposal that in such cases the narrator “serves as a proxy for the author” has a certain plausibility where Conrad’s fiction is concerned, but the degree of identification between the judgements of the narrator and the views of the author is one about which it is dangerous to generalize in Conrad’s case; it varies from work to work, and develops as Conrad matures as a man and an author.

If the term “omniscient” seems too all-encompassing to be used of Conrad’s narrators, the alternatives – “zero-focalized narrator,” “authorial narrator,” “third-person narrator,” “extradiegetic narrator” – all have their shortcomings. I have chosen the most open one: “third-person narrator,” even though Conrad’s habit of having his narrator drop momentarily into the first person in *Nostromo* and *The Secret Agent* problematizes even this term, as these shifts seem to open – if only for a brief instant – for the possibility of an omniscient first-person narrator. Excluding these examples as special cases and uncharacteristic exceptions, it is arguable that Conrad provides only one character who believes that he is more or less all-knowing – Captain Mitchell – and few readers will share this captain’s opinion of himself.

Terminology aside, what I want to focus on can be summed up in a multi-part question: what do Conrad’s third-person narrators know, apart from what they know about the thoughts and actions of at least some of their characters; what effect does our sense of the extent of this knowledge have on our reading; to what extent is our knowledge of Conrad the author incorporated in our willingness (or unwillingness) to treat this knowledge as reliable; and what sort of textual element has the capacity to challenge the process of obstination and lead us to withdraw our trust in the reliability of narrator generalizations about the extrafictional world in Conrad’s works?

In her book *Fictions of Authority: Women Writers and Narrative Voice*, Susan Sniader Lanser distinguishes usefully between narrators “who simply predicate the words and actions of fictional characters – and those who undertake ‘extrarepresentational’ acts: reflections, judgments, generalizations about the world ‘beyond’ the fiction” (Lanser 1992, 16). In the quoted passage Conrad’s narrator does both – giving us the words and actions of Captain McWhirr but also making generalizations that, I argue, reach beyond the world of the fiction. In mixing these different sorts of narrative act the narrator also builds up a personification of himself (if the narrator is to be attributed a gendered identity – which is not certain – it is, I think, himself not

herself here) in spite of the fact that he knows things that no real-life person could know about other human beings. Thus if the narrator of “Typhoon” is in some ways godlike, he is a god with distinctly human characteristics on occasions. He responds, for example, to McWhirr, in a way that suggests human individuality: finding, for example, the captain’s desire to be remembered to his children “quaint” – a response very similar to Solomon Rout’s amused reaction to the captain’s struggle with his umbrella in the second paragraph of the story. (Can we imagine an all-knowing god who, by virtue of his total knowledge can never be surprised by anything, finding a human being’s behaviour “quaint”?) A constant feature in Conrad’s fiction is his habit of encouraging – even requiring – readers at least temporarily to detect qualities associated with a particular human individuality in his third-person narrators.

This opens the way to another shift in the passage from “Typhoon,” one involving tone. If in the first quoted paragraph we can imagine a smile playing over the face of the narrator much as it does over Solomon Rout’s as he observes the furling of the umbrella, when the narrative moves to a generalization about the China seas, the tone becomes serious, focussed, and objective. We move away from a narrator with distinctly human qualities and find that the process of telling has been taken over by an altogether less chummy informant.

My earlier point that third-person, so-called omniscient, narrators are generally taken to be “reliable” unless there is something in their comments that raises doubts in the reader, needs some qualification at this juncture. Lanser repeats Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan’s point that the more “overt” a narrator becomes, the more “his chances of becoming fully reliable are diminished” (Lanser 1992, 17); this is doubtless because overttness increases human-ness and decreases godlike-ness. So far as the passage from “Typhoon” is concerned, there is a seepage from our knowledge of Conrad the author, about whose life and experience modern readers are familiar enough to assume that he knows his stuff about the China seas, into the person of the narrator of the story, who appears to declaim about this stretch of sea with the full support of his creator, and the backing of his creator’s arsenal of experience. There is also, of course, seepage in the opposite direction: the knowledge displayed by the narrator further develops the reader’s awareness of the author’s knowledge and opinions (and not just the implied author, about whom more below, but the flesh-and-blood author). If a narrator knows something, then it seems inescapable that his or her creator knows it too. Writers frequently testify to their surprise at what their characters do and say, but not at what their unpersonified narrators know. Conrad’s first readers may not, of course, have been as familiar with the author’s background and experiences as are almost all modern readers, but the text itself manifests a confidence with regard to statements concerning the China seas that would encourage any reader with zero knowledge of Conrad the man to suspect that here was an individual who was not ignorant about these waters.

We would, I think, read a similar generalization about the China seas in a novel by Jane Austen or Henry James rather differently from the way we read it in “Typhoon” – and were such a generalization to appear in a newly discovered text by Austen or James we would have to do some hasty and extensive revision of our view of these two novelists and their narrators – even though Austen’s brother Francis William was a seaman who eventually became Admiral of the Fleet. That is one reason why there is a problem with the concept of narratorial omniscience. Jane Austen’s narrator typically knows what her characters are saying, thinking, and doing, but

we assume (just possibly wrongly) that she and her creator know little – if anything – about the China seas, north or south. If omniscience requires total knowledge of both the fictional and the non-fictional worlds, then Austen’s narrator is not godlike – and neither is any third-person narrator. Conrad’s reader, I think, takes the narrator’s statement in this passage as reliable and objective, as a true statement not just within the world of the fiction, but in the real world outside the fiction.

I made brief reference earlier to the term “implied author.” This term, coined first by Wayne C. Booth, denotes that sense of a real-life person behind a fictional narrative that a reader builds up solely or substantially on the basis of evidence gleaned from the text itself. Thus when we observe that a particular phrase or passage is “Dickensian,” we are not usually associating it with statements made outside his fiction by Charles Dickens, but are rather suggesting that it brings to mind the “Charles Dickens” that we build up from a reading of the novels. The term has its uses, but I find it generally redundant when discussing Conrad’s fiction, as “author” and “narrator” seem adequate to cover the reader’s sense of a source and authority for the words and the account they render. This said, what is admittedly useful about the term is that it reminds us that readers may build up a sense of the person behind the fiction, and that person’s narrator-mouthpieces, cumulatively, from work to work. Against this, as I have already suggested, Conrad’s development as a writer and maturing as a person mean that the implied Conrad of *Almayer’s Folly* and the implied Conrad of *The Secret Agent*, and their narrators, are not without significant differences. This said, the term does have the virtue of reminding us that the figure of the author lurks in a more or less ghost-like way behind that of the narrator. In Conrad’s fictions, indeed, the figure of the author is considerably less ghostlike than is the figure of the author in many other novels and short stories.

It is quite possible, of course, that a reader who does happen to possess knowledge of the China seas might not be too happy with narrator’s comment (I have heard grumpy comments from sailors that some of the stuff about typhoons in Conrad’s story is not to be relied upon), and I want now to turn to the issue of what happens when a reader resists a narrator’s “extrarepresentational generalizations.” Before doing so, however, it is necessary to confront the fact that determining the intended or assumed scope of a generalization in a work of fiction is not always straightforward. “All happy families are alike; each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.” Is this a claim about the fictional world in which Anna Karenina has her being, or an assertion that reaches beyond Tolstoy’s novel to encompass the world in which he lived, and we live? The question assumes that the answer must be either one or the other of the stated alternatives, but the reality is I think more complex. My response would be that although the reader who begins *Anna Karenina* reads this sentence as a claim about the world in general and not just about the fictional world displayed in the pages to come, the claim is taken to have a specific bearing on the pages awaiting our reading, and is accordingly granted provisional assent and read differently from the way it would be read were it to be the opening sentence in a self-help book entitled *How to Ensure that Your Marriage is a Happy One*. To adapt Coleridge’s much quoted words, when we encounter this claim at the start of Tolstoy’s novel we suspend any disbelief that the words might have elicited had they been encountered in another context. We do not make the same demands of such generalizations in works of narrative fiction as we do in

other contexts. Tolstoy's opening sentence did not cause me to start wondering whether or not it was true when first I read the novel; it was only when I found it hard to remember whether it was happy or unhappy families that were all the same that it struck me that the statement is just not true of family life in the world outside of the fiction. Tolstoy's opening sentence does make claims about both the fictional world of *Anna Karenina* and also the world in general, but readers generally reserve judgement about the larger claims until, perhaps, they have finished the novel.

Generalizations uttered by a third-person narrator that evoke dissent on the part of the reader do not necessarily betoken failure on the writer's part, but it is the case that in such instances the effect is different.

Here is another example from Conrad, which also focuses on language.

"Slavery is an awful thing," stammered out Kayerts in an unsteady voice.

"Frightful ... the sufferings ..." grunted Carlier with conviction.

They believed their words. Everybody shows a respectful deference to certain sounds that he and his fellows can make. But about feelings people really know nothing. We talk with indignation, or enthusiasm, we talk about oppression, cruelty, crime, devotion, self sacrifice, virtue – and we know nothing real beyond the words. Nobody knows what suffering or sacrifice mean – except, perhaps, the victims of the mysterious purpose of these illusions. (Conrad 2012, 90–91)

As in the case of the passage from "Typhoon," this passage focusses on the extent to which words do or do not capture and accurately convey a precise reality. The words uttered by Kayerts and Carlier seem clichéd in the face of the violence that has taken place; indeed, they seem more like a means to avoid thinking about this reality than tools to specify its precise human awfulness with precision – exactly what a cliché is and does. It is the narrator's move to generalize on the basis of the inadequacy of this reaction that is problematic. The generalizing impulse in this passage is clearly marked by the use of words such as "everybody," "people," "we" (repeated three times), and "nobody." (Compare Tolstoy's "all.") Unlike the claims made in the passage from "Typhoon," however, the assertions in this passage are unlikely to be accepted without demur by most readers.

To start with, there is the problem of internal contradiction. If "we know nothing real beyond the words," then how does the narrator (who we assume includes himself under "we"), know that this is true? Moreover, given that the claim is made in words, and it is argued that we know nothing beyond the words, how are we to agree or disagree with their message? This is structuralism's prison-house of language (again, *avant la lettre*), a prison-house in which words are unreliable but those who use words have no access to the things to which words refer other than these suspect words. The passage claims that only "victims" know "what suffering or sacrifice mean," that only they know something "real beyond the words," but if this is true then to possess this knowledge the narrator must, logically, himself be a victim – and even this truth is qualified by the word "perhaps." The attitude towards language in this passage comes close to that mocked in Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* when Gulliver visits the "School of Languages," whose members believe that since "Words are only Names for *Things*, it would be more

convenient for all Men to carry about them, such *Things* as were necessary to express the particular Business they are to discourse on” (Gulliver 1726, 76) This is a sentiment for which Conrad might be expected to have some sympathy, given his frequent comments on the unreliability of language, but Conrad is, outside his fiction, very able to distinguish between good and bad uses of language. In his 1917 essay “The Unlighted Coast,” for example, he contrasts two sorts of “war-talk,” a contrast inspired by listening to exchanges between the wireless man and an officer on board a ship on coastal wartime patrol.

War-talk. But how different from the war-talk we hear on the lips of men (and even great men) which often seems but talk around the war, obscuring the one and only question: To be or not to be – the great alternative of an appeal to arms. The other, the grouped-letters war-talk, almost without sound and altogether without fury, is full of sense, of meaning and single-minded purpose: inquiries, information, orders, reports. Words too. But words in direct relation to things and facts, with the feeling at the back of it all of the correct foresight that planned and of the determination which carries on the protective work. (Conrad 210, 38–9)<sup>1</sup>

In 1917 Conrad has a more nuanced view of language from that advanced in “An Outpost of Progress,” which was written in 1896. However even here, as in my opening quotation from “Typhoon,” there is still a yearning for an escape-route from language’s prison-house through words that have a “direct relation to things and facts.” The Shakespearian double-whammy in the passage lays claim to a distinguished tradition of suspicion of language, but actually turns the ur-text’s message upside-down: while for Macbeth life is “a tale | Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, | Signifying nothing,” the language of sailors on active military duty is without both sound and fury but full of sense.

The possibility of good and bad language habits entails a need to distinguish between good and bad users of language, but such a discrimination is rendered impossible in the passage from “An Outpost of Progress” by the use of generalizers such as “everybody” and “we.” The passage moves from exposing the shallowness of Kayerts and Carlier, to stating that their inability to get beyond cliché when faced with brutality is one that “we” all share. Like Tolstoy (for whose works, as it happens, Conrad had little sympathy) the passage shows little fear of all-encompassing generalizations. But if we are all, morally and linguistically, on the same level as Kayerts and Carlier, then our response to the words on the page, the words formulated by Conrad and presented by his narrator, will be as shallow as is the response of Kayerts and Carlier to the abandoned books that the two characters discover and discuss.

If like me other readers resist the generalizations in this passage, then the existential status of the narrator comes under pressure. Rather than being a reliable source for the “extrarepresentational” truths he delivers, he segues into something more like a character

---

<sup>1</sup> I discuss this and other passages in which Conrad contrasts reliable and unreliable uses of language, in my *Joseph Conrad: Language and Fictional Self-Consciousness* (London: Edward Arnold, 1979), especially pages 7–36.

narrator, and a worryingly opinionated and wrong-headed one at that. Such a transformation may be temporary or permanent. As Conradians know from the example of *The Nigger of the 'Narcissus'*, Conrad – and especially the early Conrad – is quite capable of allowing his narrators to morph from all-seeing eyes to human individuals with the restricted vision that is part of our universal lot, and back again, although in other works the shifts are less extreme and noticeable than they are in this work. The final quoted sentence in the passage from “An Outpost of Progress” presents its own problems: “Nobody knows what suffering or sacrifice mean – except, perhaps the victims of the mysterious purpose of these illusions.” To start with, the syntax of the latter part of this sentence makes Hampton Court maze look like a Roman road. Is it the illusions that have a purpose, or some force that creates the illusions in pursuance of a mysterious purpose? There is a mysterious purpose, this creates illusions, and these illusions have victims. But presumably there is something additional, some malign entity, that is possessed of the mysterious purpose – generally speaking mysterious purposes have to be the purposes of someone or something.

In summary: this particular passage causes the reader to resist its generalizations for two reasons. First, because it is at times incoherent and illogical, and second because rather than dealing with a fact of geography such as the China seas, it attempts to pontificate about human beings and their ways of dealing with such things as suffering and sacrifice.

It is most often in Conrad's early works that the reader encounters generalizations that appear to assume assent on the part of the reader, but that actually provoke dissent. This is from *Almayer's Folly*.

Neither of them spoke. He was regaining his senses in a slight tremor that ran upwards along his rigid body and hung about his trembling lips; she drew back her head and fastened her eyes on his, in one of those long looks that are a woman's most terrible weapon; a look that is more stirring than the closest touch, and more dangerous than the thrust of a dagger because it also whips the soul out of the body but leaves the body alive and helpless, to be swayed here and there by the capricious tempests of passion and desire. – A look that enwraps the whole body, that penetrates into the innermost recesses of a being bringing terrible defeat in the delirious uplifting of accomplished conquest. It has the same meaning for the man of the forests and the sea as for the man threading the paths of the more dangerous wilderness of houses and streets. Men that had felt in their breasts the awful exultation such a look awakens become mere things of to-day – which is paradise; forget yesterday – which was suffering; care not for to-morrow – which may be perdition. They wish to live under that look for ever. It is the look of woman's surrender. – (Conrad 1994, 128–29)

There can be few readers today who find the generalizations in this passage unexceptional. One result of a readerly resistance to the claims about the man of the forest and the sea and the man of the more dangerous wilderness of houses and streets is that the ghostly author becomes very much more too-solid flesh: an inescapable presence, pushing his avatar the all-seeing narrator very much into the background.



Such resistance on the part of readers to narrative generalizations in Conrad's works occurs much less frequently in the period of his greatest achievements. The works of Conrad's "major phase," in Jacques Berthoud's term, frequently surprise the reader with generalizing comments that summarize aptly characters and events within the telling, but that also have a convincing purchase beyond the fiction.

The cruel futility of things stood unveiled in the levity and sufferings of that incorrigible people; the cruel futility of lives and of deaths thrown away in the vain endeavour to attain an enduring solution of the problem. Unlike Decoud, Charles Gould could not play lightly a part in a tragic farce. It was tragic enough for him in all conscience, but he could see no farcical element. He suffered too much under a conviction of irremediable folly. He was too severely practical and too idealistic to look upon its terrible humours with amusement, as Martin Decoud, the imaginative materialist, was able to do in the dry light of his scepticism. To him, as to all of us, the compromises with his conscience appeared uglier than ever in the light of failure. (Conrad 1947, 364)

That final sentence seems to me splendid, and the generalizing "all of us," rather than eliciting the reader's resistance, appears perfectly justified. Not only does the claim make perfect sense in the light of developments within the fiction, but it has every reader searching the history of his or her own conscience and, I think, granting sad assent.

Here, in conclusion, is another example from *Nostromo*.

A transgression, a crime, entering a man's existence, eats it up like a malignant growth, consumes it like a fever. Nostromo had lost his peace; the genuineness of all his qualities was destroyed. He felt it himself, and often cursed the silver of San Tomé. His courage, his magnificence, his leisure, his work, everything was as before, only everything was a sham. But the treasure was real. (523–4)

Here we start with the generalizing comment and then proceed to follow its substantiation in the summary of what we have witnessed happening to Nostromo in the fiction. Like Charles Gould, Nostromo has been infected by the fever of the silver and is eaten up by its cancerous growth within him. Part of the greatness of *Nostromo* is precisely that the generalizations it contains sit securely on the evidence of character and event in the fiction, while projecting their truth outwards into the real world of the reader – in Conrad's own time, and in our own.

### **Acknowledgment**

An earlier version of this essay was presented at the 44th Annual International Conference of the Joseph Conrad Society (UK), Writtle College, Chelmsford, July 2018.

## Works cited

Conrad, Joseph. *Almayer's Folly. A Story of an Eastern River*. Floyd Eugene Eddleman and David Leon Higdon (eds). The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Joseph Conrad. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Conrad, Joseph. *Last Essays*. Harold Ray Stevens and J. H. Stape (eds). The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Joseph Conrad. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Conrad, Joseph. *The Nigger of the "Narcissus," Typhoon, Falk, and Other Stories*. Dent Collected Edition. London: Dent, 1950.

Conrad, Joseph. *Nostramo. A Tale of the Seaboard*. Dent Collected Edition. London: Dent, 1947.

Conrad, Joseph. *Tales of Unrest*. Allan H. Simmons and J. H. Stape (eds). The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Joseph Conrad. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Dawson, Paul. *The Return of the Omniscient Narrator. Authorship and Authority in Twenty-first Century Fiction*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 2013.

Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Foreword by Jonathan Culler. Oxford: Blackwell. 1980. First published in French, 1972.

Gulliver, Captain Lemuel. (Pseud. Jonathan Swift.) *Travels into Several Remote Nations of the World*. Volume II. London, Benjamin Motte, 1726.

Lanser, Susan Sniader. *Fictions of Authority: Women Writers and Narrative Voice*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1992.