

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Ernest Hemingway's *Across the River and into the Trees*:
A Study in Narrative Technique

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English
in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts in English

By
Jagadish Sapakota

Central Department of English
Kirtipur, Kathmandu
May, 2006

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCE

This thesis titled " Ernest Hemingway's *Across the River and into the Trees*: A Study in Narrative Technique submitted to Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Jagadish Sapakota has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of Research Committee:

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head

Central Department of English

Date :- _____

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the scholarly guidance invaluable suggestions and constant support of my thesis supervisor Mr. Sharad Chandra Thakur of Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University. I express my sincere gratitude to him.

I am grateful to Prof. Chandra Prakash Sharma, the Head of the Central Department of English for his cooperation and motivation.

I would like to express my gratitude to my respected teachers Mr. Devi Gautam, Mr. Rajendra Panthi and Mr. Hem Sharma who helped me in many ways during the research period.

I am equally thankful to my friends Mr. Dilli Timilsena, Mr. Badri Prasad Acharya, Mr. Rajan Pande, Mr. Navaraj Pande and Mr. Sagar Bhatta who encouraged me and offered their help during the period of my research.

Likewise I want to thank Mr. Madhu Bk. and Mr. Narayan Manandhar of Global Cyber Cafe, New Baneshwor, Sankhamul for the efficient typing of the manuscript.

May 2006

Jagadish Sapakota.

Contents

		Page No.
Chapter-I	General Introduction	1
Chapter-II	Discussion of Tool	12
	Narrative Technique in Fiction: The Development of a	
	Critical Concept	12
	Focalization in Narrative Technique	19
Chapter-III	Analysis of Text	30
	Narrative Technique in Hemingway's <i>Across the River and in</i>	
	<i>to the Trees</i>	30
	Dramatization of Love and Death with Special Relation to	
	Narrative Technique	40
	A New Dialogue: Hemingway's Legacy	43
	The Cult of Simplicity	46
	The Technique of Repetition	47
Chapter-IV	Conclusion	49
Works Cited		52

Abstract

The story between the duck-shoot of the first chapter and the duck-shoot at the end of the novel is not an interior monologue as critics call it, but a flash-back in the third- person oblique method, with the omniscient narrator's voice being occasionally heard. Hemingway's narrative technique is constructed stone by stone and the different pieces of its structure, like Venice or St. Mark's, articulate his writing and its calculus. Each narrative technique fits into the other as different building blocks dovetail into the architectural whole.

Chapter I

General Introduction

The form of a good work of art arises organically out of its theme, which discovers the appropriate techniques and makes itself manifesto through them. This makes the study of writer's basic themes a pre-requisite for a proper appreciation of his technique. A close examination of Hemingway's work reveals that the whole of his oeuvre can be taken as a single unit the general pattern of which is implicit in his famous novel *Across the River and into the Trees*.

In 1954, when Ernest Hemingway was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature -for his powerful style, forming mastery of the art of modern narrative technique- Hemingway, who did not attend the ceremonies in Stockholm, sent an acceptance message in the course of which he said:

Things may not be immediately discernible in what a man writes, and in this sometimes he is fortunate; but eventually they are quite clear and by these and the degree of alchemy that he possesses, he will endure or be forgotten. [. . .] for a true writer each book should be a new beginning where he tries again for something that is beyond attainment. (*Carlos Baker* 339)

This passage presents Hemingway's aesthetic (narrative technique) in a nutshell. His aesthetic opinion is stated most in *Across the River and into the Trees*. Hemingway's narrative technique could be best described as a style of eloquent repression. His original and unmistakable idioms have been variously described as a lean, simple, terse, laconic, idiomatic, sparse, " minimalist" prose. There has been much talk of his simple diction of the spare, pared down sentences, of his clipped dialogue, the simplified syntax, the short, declarative sentences the overabundance of "ands", the lack of subordination, the trick of repetition, etc. In sum, the main hallmarks of narrative technique are the taut sentences , the

monosyllabic vocabulary, the stark dialogue, the technique of leaving things out, sharpness, clarity. They illustrate the principle that the author was to state in *Across the River and into the Trees*. Writing of early days in Paris he says:

I was trying to write then and I found the greatest difficulty, aside from knowing what you really felt, rather than what you were supposed to feel, and had been taught to feel, was to put down what really happened in action: what the actual things were which produced the emotion that you experienced[. . .] the real thing, the sequence of motion and fact which made the emotion. (*The American Scholar* 519)

This is a striking equivalent of the better-known theory of "objective correlative", previously formulated by T.S. Eliot in his *Sacred Wood* (1920). As such, this is a key to an understanding of Hemingway's method of writing fiction that is narrative technique.

This research is an inquiry into Ernest Hemingway's narrative technique in *Across the River and into the Trees*. The present research will prove how the narrative technique of Hemingway is an equation that conflates the past and present into a timelessness that dramatizes love and death. This study will specify on narrative technique deployed in *Across the River and into the Trees*.

The narrative technique of an author in any novel is crucial to the reader's understanding of the narrative. The way in which a novel is written influences the way in which the reader interprets the events which occur throughout the novel and allows the author to convey the feeling of time, place, and people in the society (in which the author is attempting to impart to his or her readers).

In *Across the River and into the Trees*, Hemingway uses a variety of narrative techniques in order to convey his own impressions of the society in which both he and his character Colonel Cantwell lived. Hemingway's use of a third person omniscient narrator

who is all knowing of what other characters say and think. Hemingway had, in fact, two distinct ways of presenting his narrative technique. The first, and more often imitated, is a flat, understated newspaper style (narrative technique) in which he gave realistic description, usually in short, simple sentences. He derived this mode of presentation from his training as a newspaper reporter. In 1917, when he graduated from Oak Park High School only shortly after the United States had entered the First World War, he decided to skip college and go to work for the *Kansas City Star* as a reporter. He may well have learned more about writing by making this choice. The style sheet (that is narrative technique) of the *Star* contained 110 rules, such as, " use short sentences. Use short first paragraph. Use vigorous prose. Be positive, not negative; avoid the use of adjectives, especially such extravagant ones as *splendid, gorgeous, grand, magnificent, etc*"(*American Fiction* 100). From his early exposure to journalism Hemingway absorbed the discipline of his craft: he learned to write succinctly , to avoid superfluous adjectives and adverbs, and to pack the maximum content into the minimum space. So the buzzword is *economy*. The Hemingway character opts for understatement. The newspaper style (narrative technique) is evident in *Across the River and into the Trees*.

The second mode of presentation is impressionistic in viewpoint and rhythmic in sentences structure, often echoing the repetition and seeming simplicity of Gertrude Stein. Indeed, in Paris Hemingway fell under the spell of Stein's undulating prose with its consecutive phrases connected by " ands" in an almost Biblical manner, its understatement, and its trick of repeating an image or an idea until it has become imbedded in the reader's mind. Ezra Pound's also proved to be a lasting influence. Indeed, among the modernist shapers of American Fiction between the two wars it was Hemingway who most consciously and successfully adopted the spirit and major tenets of Anglo-American brand of narrative method.

The rhythmic-undulating- cadenced prose, the imagistic-impressionistic style may be seen in *Across the River and into the Trees*. In addition Hemingway did more than any single writer in English to vitalize the writing of *dialogue*. No matter which narrative technique he is using, his dialogue generally remains constant, giving us nearly as possible the illusion of real speech, often to the point of dullness. The terse dialogue is most often almost bare of comment and full conversational blind alleys and *non sequiturs*. All his life a good listener, he managed, by stripping speech to the essentials typical of the speaker and by building patterns of mannerism and responses peculiar to him, to produce the illusion that the people conversing in his work are actually speaking and not, as for instance in the work of Henry James, that he is speaking for them.

The aim of the two dominant modes of presentation is generally compression and an attempt to create a distinct impression or mood. The short simple sentences describing Colonel Cantwell in Venice serve the artistic purpose of Hemingway's narrative technique. In brief, Hemingway's styles and techniques at their very best convey spiritual as well as material effects. In this respect his work is in the tradition of symbolic realism that includes Twain, James, Faulkner, Fitzgerald, and Katherine Anne Porter. Although the actions and speech of Hemingway's people may be more sensational than James's, for example, and although he presents a stronger photographic or realistic surface, his work is not less symbolic than that of James. The death of Colonel in *Across the River and into the Trees* and the suffering and defeat of Santiago in *The Old Man and the Sea* are not merely realistic depiction of physical events; that they are symbolic renderings of that quality of human life James called "ferocious and sinister". Hemingway's style could also be conceived as "poetic" (the "poetic" mode as opposed to the "documentary" approach) as described by Willa Cather in her well known critical essay *The Novel Demeuble (The Unfurnished Novel)*.

It was Hemingway's narrative technique that made him the most popular, the most critically acclaimed, and the most imitated author of his time. He defined the essence of his spare, lean style to an interviewer in 1954:

I always try to write on the principle of the iceberg. There is seven- eighths of it under water for every part that shows. Anything you know you can eliminate and it only strengthens your iceberg. It is part that doesn't show. If a writer omits something because he does not know it there is a hole in the story. ("Nightmare and Rituals in Hemingway", *Critical Essays* 40)

This axiom provides an approach to the strategies behind both the exacting manner and the hard-edged matter of his fiction especially in *Across the River and into the Trees*. A Hemingway story's depths of meaning and feeling are often submerged in words composed in a detached, clipped, journalistic method of description, with little narrative commentary, little context with the dialogue, and little explanation for changes of scene. It seems at first that not very much has happened during the events of such a story, that something is missing. In order to begin to "get it" the reader must join in composing the narrative technique, paying careful attention to each word and phrase, noting important repetition and oppositions, filling in the text's strategic gaps. This "minimalist" style, with its deceptively simple surface, invites and challenges readers to draw on their knowledge and experience in order to discover what deeper meanings and emotions there might be below. This style also appeared exactly the right approach to convey the emptiness felt by characters wandering aimlessly in a seemingly meaningless world.

As regards influences on his style, besides, Hemingway's newspaper training and Gertrude Stein, Mark Twain also comes to mind. Hemingway himself calls:

All modern American literature comes from one book by Mark Twain called *Huckleberry Finn*. If you read it you must stop where the Nigger Jim is stolen

from the boys. That is real end. The rest is cheating. But it is best book we've had. All American writing comes from that. There was nothing as good since. (qtd. *Green Hills of Africa* 77).

This is a broad overstatement, but Twain's successful attempt to write as an American boy might speak was indeed the beginning of a wide spread contemporary style, informal and colloquial, fresh and occasionally poetic, to which Hemingway, after Twain made the most notable contribution.

Hemingway's text is the result of a painstaking selection process, each word performing an assigned function in the narrative technique. The choices of language, in turn, occur through the mind and experience of his novel's central characters whether they serve explicitly as narrators of their experience or as focal characters from whose perspectives the story unfolds. The main working corollary of Hemingway's "iceberg principle" is that the full meaning of the text is not limited to moving the plot forward: there is always a web of association and inference, a submerged reason behind the inclusion (or even the omission) of every detail.

We note, too, that although Hemingway's novels usually follow a straight forward chronological progression as in two days of *Across the River and into the Trees*. Hemingway does make use of summary accounts of the past, of memories related externally as stories, and of flash-backs. These devices lend further depth to his characters and create narrative technique that are not completely straightforward chronicles.

Many critics, scholars and novelists have analyzed *Across the River and into the Trees* from different perspectives like feminist, existentialist and linguistic. These approach no matter whether they are author oriented or reader oriented or language oriented- have tried to interpret it or invest this novel with meaning. The approach of the present research differs

from those previous approaches in a sense that the present research analyses narrative technique deployed in the novel.

When *Across the River and into the Trees* was published in 1950, negative criticism was almost unanimous. Some 150 newspaper and magazine critics reviewed the book and most of them panned it. The novel was characterized as disappointing, trivial, garrulous, and tired. In an interview in *New York Times Book Review* Hemingway defended himself by saying that the critics were confused by the novel's experimental complexity (*Breit* 14). "In writing I have moved through arithmetic, through plane geometry and algebra, and now I am in calculus" (qtd. in *Bruculi* 62). More than fifty years after Hemingway's statement readers familiar with metafiction and the nouveau roman have little difficulty with *Across the River and into the Trees's* circular structure, time shifts and inner resonanc, and the complexity of the novel is no longer daunting or, worse, dismissible. At the time, Hemingway's frustration at not being understood stemmed from the fact that in his final years his subjects of war, love and remembrance were " all explorations into death's fusion with a creative consciousness" (*Listoe* 94).

Unlike many of Hemingway's other works, *Across the River and into the Trees* was not as critically acclaimed. Although it was very popular, and Hemingway believed it was the best book he had ever written. The best it is not, but its experimental complexity has elicited a number of revaluations that may indeed reveal a calculus of writing that is narrative technique. Commenting on *Hemingway's Across the River and into the Trees* , P.G Rama Rao writes: " Hemingway's usual narrative technique is overshadowed by romantic style in novel which reads for the most part like a fifty-year-old Colonel's sentimental account" (111). He further writes:

There is much unnecessary un- Hemingwayesque literariness about it as in the echoes from Marlow and Eliot (p. 213), and from Blake (p.149). The

purposive controlled use of quotations which has been distinguishing mark as a stylist so far seems to have been thrown to the winds in this novel. The bare, whittled down, yet evocative style seems sacrificed in favour of the technique of presenting the Colonel's consciousness, the manipulation of the time factor and the symbolic structure of the novel. (111)

These comments sum up perceptively the characteristic preoccupation of Hemingway's fiction and of the narrative technique that the related texts explore. Carlos Baker comments upon Hemingway's fiction: "an important feature of this novel is the narrative focus which is on the Colonel from beginning to end, it is not shifted even for a moment" (*Critics and Essays* 81).

Stewart F Sanderson says: "Hemingway's narrative technique in *Across the River and into the Trees* is characteristically simple to concrete, emphatic as the rain of bullets, largely monosyllabic and innocent of subordination as rich in "and's" as the English Bible" (*Kenyon Review XIII* [Autumn 1951]). Similarly Alex Wilber comments "*Across the River and into the Trees* was not a story that truly demonstrates the complete style and form we have come to expect from Ernest Hemingway" (*Supra* 7). Following the above ideas of Wilber, Peter B. High comments: "The language is rarely emotional, rather it controls emotion, it holds them in. The aim of language is to suggest a kind of stoicism. This same stoicism is often the main theme in Hemingway's *Across the River and into the Trees*" (*An Outline of American Literature* 174).

Hemingway uses symbolic techniques in a closely controlled, if not a very limited way. He scarcely ever loses over his narrative techniques, just as his protagonist or he himself would with the greatest control over a gun or a glass of liquor. Commenting on Hemingway's *Across the River and into the Trees* Ben Stoltzful writes:

Hemingway describes events, places and people using an allusive vocabulary that does not theorize. His narrative forces the reader to connect the parts by analyzing the poetic resonance of the floating signifiers[. . .]. Hemingway walks the reader to the bridges that he or she must cross alone without the narrator's help (*The Hemingway Review* 9).

This does not mean that Hemingway's *Across the River and into Trees* is easy reading, for he is intensely implicational, and his pages juxtaposition is very important. He rarely interprets his juxtapositions for us: he will tell us what his characters said or did, but he leaves us to our own resources in the matter of interpretation. George Snell has spoken suggestively of his "submerged" meanings. He uses key phrases as a composer uses them and Beach compares him, in this aspects to James, though Hemingway employs the device more for emotional effect than as James does, for clarification of meaning (narrative technique).

Hemingway sets forth his ambition to achieve narrative technique in his talk with Kandisky in *Across the River and into the trees*.

The kind of writing that can be done. How far prose can be carried, if anyone is serious enough and has luck. There is fourth and fifth dimention that can be gotten [. . .] It is much more difficulty than poetry. It is a prose that has never been written. But it can be written without tricks and without cheating. (*The Twentieth Century Novel: Studies in Technique* 26-27)

The factors that go into the making of such a prose (narrative technique) are catalogued as Kiplingesque talent and Flaubertian discipline. Hemingway had already been famous for his narrative technique when he made the above observation. It is important to notice that Hemingway said that such a prose had never been written. Obviously, he thought that there were certain dimensions yet to be achieved in his prose. He does not make any

claims for himself in this passage, but only points to the possibility of achieving the fourth and fifth dimension in writing.

Yet the novel's main action is a flash-back in the hero's mind. The love story is framed by opening and closing scenes of the hero awaiting death alone, on a duck hunt with other males, an activity from which the girl is excluded, as Maria is excluded from battle in spite of her willingness to participate. The Colonel's last act of harmonious opposition is the killing of a "lone drake" whose beauty he admires.

This research is to examine Hemingway's narrative technique in the light of his ambition to write a prose with new dimensions and his aesthetic of truthful depiction. Narrative technique for Hemingway always meant the right way to do things as in killing a bull or tracking a wild beast or catching a marlin or taking pain or death. He is reported by *Time* thus: "the right way to do it-style-is not just an idle concept [. . .] it is simply the way to get done" (*Time XIV* [December 13, 1954] 72).

On the surface Hemingway's narrative technique, like any other good narrative technique, is characterized by concreteness, economy and speed. But a deeper investigation reveals two techniques – one evocative, lyrical and tender, and the other depictive, hard-boiled and masculine. This dichotomy corresponds to the contrapuntal theme, which is central to Hemingway's narrative work-the human drama versus the everlasting earth, horological time counter pointed by geological time. The abiding earth or the great Gulf Stream, against the background of which all human effort is ineffectual, demands a tight lipped, well honed masculine prose while the human drama requires an evocative, romantic, tender prose to express its poignancy. The narrative technique is best suited to Hemingway's theme of Aphrodite locked inescapably in the arms of Ares-the tender, evocative poetic narrative technique wrapped in the embrace of the rugged simplicity of the staccato sentences. To study this novel from narrative-technique perspective Henry James, Percy

Lubbock, Norman Friedman's ideas will be applied in Hemingway's *Across the River and into the Trees* in the chapter that follows.

Chapter II

Discussion of Tool

Narrative Technique in Fiction: The Development of a Critical Concept

The art of literature, as opposed to the other arts, is by virtue of its verbal medium both cursed and blessed with the fatal capacity for talk. Its vices are the defects of its virtues: on the one hand, its range and depth of significances far exceed the scope of painting, music and sculpture; on the other, its ability to project the sensory qualities of person, place, and event is correspondingly less. While it can express more ideas and attitudes, it presents qualitatively weaker images. It is enough for the painter to attain to his palette, to get proper shade in the proper place, but the writer is torn continually between the difficulty of showing what a thing is and the ease of telling how he feels about it. The sculpture can only show; the musician, programme music notwithstanding can never tell. But literature derives its very life from this conflict-which is basic to all its forms-and the history of its aesthetic could in part be written in terms of this fundamental tension, to which the particular problem of narrative technique in fiction is related as part to whole. For the general distinction was being made, from Plato and Aristotle to Joyce and Eliot, in order that the specific one could take shape. From the ancient rhetorician's direction regarding "vividness" (*energia*) to the modern aesthetician's study of "projection" (empathy), the relationship between the author's values and attitudes, their embodiment in his work, and their effect upon the reader, have been and continue to be of crucial concern.

For our purpose it will suffice to fix the two opposite points in time between which the history of this concept may be plotted. Plato, to begin with, made a distinction, when discussing the "style" of epic poetry between "simple narration" on the one hand and "imitation" on the other. When the poet speaks in the person of another we may say that he assimilates his style to that person's manner of talking; this assimilation of himself to another,

either by the use of voice or gesture, is an *imitation* or the person whose character he assumes. But if the poet everywhere appears and never conceals himself, then the imitation is dropped and his poetry becomes *simple narration*. In Book III of *The Republic* Plato, makes Socrates tell Adeimantus on different narrative techniques:

Enough of the subject of poetry: let us now speak of style [. . .]. You are aware, I suppose, that all mythology and poetry is a narration of events, either past, present, or to come [. . .] Narration may be either simple narration or imitation [. . .] [As per pure narration] the poet [speaks] in his own person; he never even tries to distract us by assuming other character [. . .] [As per imitative narration] the poet speaks in the person of another [. . .] he assimilates his style that of [another] person. (*Critical Theory since Plato* 26-27).

Coming now to the opposite end of the curve of history, we recall a similar distinction developed by Joyce in the person of Stephen, between the lyric and the dramatic forms, with the epic as intermediary, which in no way differs in its essential outlines from that of Plato. He is speaking here of the evolution of literature from the lyric cry to impersonalized dramatic projection: "The narrative is no longer purely personal. The personality of the artist passes into the narration itself, flowing round and round the persons and the actions like a vital sea" (43). There follows the by now famous passage about the disappearance of the author: "The personality of the artist, at first cry or cadence or mood then a fluid and lambent narrative, finally refines itself out of existence, impersonalizes itself, so to speak" (381).

Let us now consider briefly the emergence of the specific application of this basic distinction to the analysis of narrative technique in fiction, for narrative technique provides a *Modus Operandi* for distinguishing the possible degrees of authorial extinction in the narrative art.

Regarding the particular problem of relation between the author, the narrator, and the story subject, Edith Wharton complained in 1925:

It seems as though such a question must precede any study of the subject chosen, since the subject is conditioned by the answer: but no critic appears to have propounded it, and it was left to Henry James to do so in one of those entangled prefaces to the definitive edition from which the technical axioms ought some day to be piously detached. (*The Writing of Fiction* 43).

As it turns out, she was more nearly correct than she knew, for not only have James's prefaces become the source and fount of critical theory in this matter but also no fewer than two full length interpretations of them had already appeared before she wrote these words; that of Beach in 1918 and that of Lubbock in 1921. But first let us examine some of the pronouncements of the master himself.

James in his prefaces (1907-09) tells us he was obsessed by the problem of finding a 'center', a 'focus' for his stories, and that it was in large measure solved by considering how the narrative vehicle could be limited by framing the action inside the consciousness of one of the characters within the plot itself. 'A beautiful infatuation this ', he comments: "always, I think, the intensity of the creative effort to get into the skin of the creature" (*James* 58). Thus, since the irresponsible illusion-breaking of the garrulous omniscient author, who tells the story as he perceives it rather than as one of his characters perceives it, is eliminated by the device, the story gains in intensity, vividness, and coherence. James further writes:

There is no economy of treatment without an adopted, a related point of view, and though I understand, under certain degrees of pressure, a represented community of vision between several parties to the action when it makes for concentration. I understand no breaking-up of the register, no action of

recording consistency, that doesn't rather scatter and weaken. (*The Art of the Novel* 37-38).

Professor Beach undertook to organize the theory of this "method" and to apply it to James's own fiction. He distinguishes among several kinds of point of view and discriminates between James's calculated shifts in focus and that arbitrary and unconsidered shift of point of view (narrative technique) within the chapter, within the paragraph, that visible manipulation of the puppets from without, which is so great a menace to illusion and intimacy.

It remained to Percy Lubbock to apply the general distinction between direct and indirect presentation- a distinction common, as we have suggested, throughout the history of aesthetics and criticism to discussion on James particular concern with point of view in fiction (narrative technique) " *The Art of Fiction* " , he claims, "does not begin until the novelist thinks of his story as a matter to be shown, to be exhibited that will tell itself " (*The Art of Fiction* 68). If artistic "truth" is a matter of compelling rendition, of creating the illusion of reality then an author speaking in his own person about the lives and fortunes of others is placing an extra obstacle between his illusion and the reader by virtue of his very presence. In order to remove this obstacle the author may choose to limit the functions of his own personal voice in one way or another:

The only law that binds him throughout, what-ever course he is pursuing is the need to be consistent on some plan, to follow the principle, he has adopted; and of course it is one of the first of his percepts as with every artist in any kind to allow himself no more latitude than he requires. (*The Art of Fiction* 69-70).

One of the chief means to this end ,the one James himself not only announced in theory but followed in practice, is to have the story told as if by a character in the story, but told in the third person. In this way the reader perceives the action as it filters through the

consciousness of one of the characters involved, yet perceives it directly as it impinges upon that consciousness, thus avoiding that removal to a distance necessitated by retrospective first person narration: "the difference is that instead of receiving his report we now see him the act of judging and reflecting; his consciousness [. . .] in its original agitation" (*Novelists on Novels* 13). Mental awareness is thus dramatized directly instead of being reported and explained indirectly by the narrator's voice, much in the same way that words and gestures may be dramatized directly (scene) rather than being summarized by the narrator (panorama).

Although one may find many shrewd observations on this point scattered throughout the writings of novelists and critics before the prefaces of James served to crystalize the main issue-for his notions did not spring full-blown from the head of Jove-we must perforce limit ourselves to a brief consideration of what happened to them after they were expounded by Beach and Lubbock. An exception may be made, however, for the work of Selden L. Whitcomb, entitled *The Study of Novel* (1905), first to our knowledge which devotes a formal section of the rubric. "The Narrator. His Narrative Technique. Here it is claimed that "the unity of a passage or a plot depends largely on the clearness and stability of (the narrator's) position" (*The Short Story* 243). This notion, coming as it does a year or two before James's prefaces seems remarkably prophetic of things to come, since from this point on almost every manual published on the art of fiction contains a similar section. During the next ten years or so we find a spate of such manual which soon grows into an avalanche, and the specific analysis of point of view (narrative technique) becomes common property.

The most significant work in the field after Beach and Lubbock, although, as we have seen she seems curiously unaware of them, is that of Mrs. Wharton herself in 1925:

It should be story-teller's first care to choose his reflecting mind deliberately, as one would choose a building-site [. . .] and when this is done, to live inside the mind chosen, trying to feel, see, and react exactly as the latter would, no more,

no less, and above all, no otherwise. Only, thus can writer avoid attributing incongruities as though and metaphor to his chosen interpreter. And from now on the manual are always with us (*A Manual of the Short Story* 21-22)

The remainder of the second decade is distinguished by demurrals of E.M. Forster in 1927, who glances briefly at our problem only to pass it up as a trivial technicality. Allowing Lubbock full credit for his "formulae", he prefers to regard the novel otherwise: the novelist's chief speciality is unhampered omniscience where by he commands all the secret life, and he must not be robbed of this privilege. He further writes:

'How did the writer know that? It is sometimes said?' What's his standpoint? He is not being consistent, he's shifting his point of view from the limited to the omniscient, and now he's edging back again: questions like these have too much the atmosphere of the law courts about them. All that matters to the reader is whether the shifting of attitude and the secret life are convincing. (*Aspects of the Novel* 118-128).

The third decade is graced chiefly by Beach's monumental study, in 1932, of the technique of the twentieth century novel, which is characterized, he says, mainly by virtue of the fact that "the story tells itself; the story speaks for itself. The author does not apologize for his characters [. . .] in which they find themselves" (*The Twentieth century Novel* 15). Apparently encouraged by the work of Lubbock, which followed shortly after his own early study of James, Beach now makes a concerted and massive onslaught upon the telling showing problem as it appears in hundreds of modern novels.

In an essay dated 1941 we find Allen Tate taking up the gauntlet cast down by Forster:

The limited and thus credible authority for the action, which is gained by putting the knower of the action inside its frame, is perhaps the distinctive

feature of the modern novel; and it is, in all the infinite shifts of focus of which it is capable, the specific feature which more than any other has made it possible for the novelist to achieve an objective structure. (*The Post of Observation in Fiction* 35-39).

The really significant advance in the theory of narrative technique which occurred in the forties is the work of Mark Schorer in 1948. If Lubbock was concerned with the narrative technique as a means to a coherent and vivid presentation, Schorer takes it one step further by examining "the uses of narrative technique not only as a mode of dramatic delimitation, but more particularly, of thematic definition" (*Technique as Discovery* 17). A novel, he says, normally reveals a created world of values and attitudes, and an author is assisted in his search for an artistic definition of these values and attitudes by the controlling medium offered by the devices of narrative technique; through these devices he is able to disentangle his own prejudices and predispositions from those of his characters and thereby to evaluate those of his characters dramatically in relation to one another within their own frame. He has here the concurrence of Ellen Glasgow, who wrote in 1943: "To be too near, it appears, is more fatal in literature than to be too far away; for it is better that the creative writer [. . .] overwhelmed by emotion" (*A Certain Measure* 18-19). The novelist must separate the subject from the object in the act of creation; he does this by "total immersion" or "projection" into the materials of his story. Finally, that the telling showing distinction is established as a common place of the criticism of fiction is evidenced by its latest reiteration in the work of Bernard De Veto, as well as in the current handbooks.

Having traced the development of this key concept, we may now attempt a concrete and coherent definition of its parts and their relationships. Such a definition will be produced if we can manage to codify the questions of which these distinction are answers, and if we can arrange these answers into some semblance of logical sequence.

Since the problem of the narrator is adequate transmission of his story to the reader, the questions must be something like the following:

1. Who talks to the reader? - author in third or first person, character in first or ostensibly no one;
2. From what position (angle) regarding the story does he tell it? - above, periphery, center, front or shifting;
3. What channels of information does the narrator use to convey the story to the reader? - author's words, thoughts, perception, feelings, or character's words and actions, or character's thoughts, perceptions and feelings: through which of these or combination of these three possible media does information regarding mental states, setting situation, and character come?;
4. At what distance does he place the reader from the story? - near or far and shifting.

Our major distinction is between "telling" and "showing", the sequence of the answers should proceed by degrees from one extreme to the other: from the statement to inference from exposition to presentation from narrative to drama, from explicit to implicit, from idea to image.

Focalization in Narrative Technique

We have noticed that traditional point of view theory confuses two separate questions: 'who sees or whose vision is presented?' and 'who speaks or who tells the story?' However, we can easily notice the clear-cut distinction between the agent who speaks (narrator) and the agent who perceives or sees (focalizer) easily in practice in third person narrative. Gerard Genette, one of the most influential French narratologists, introduces the concept of focalization in his *Narrative Discourse: An Essay on Method* to distinguish narrator from focalizer, or in other words narration from focalization, "The two instances of the focalizing and the narrating which remain distinct even in "first person" narrative, i.e., even when the

two instances are taken up by the same person" (*Narrative Discourse* 194). For Genette focalization, view point or perspective, which is to say the point of view from which the story is narrated, and narration, story telling 'remain distinct' not only in third person narrative but also in first person narrative. For him, narration and focalization are quite distinct processes.

The distinction between narrator, an agent who narrates or speaks and focalizer, an agent who perceives within the fictional world is obvious in the third person narrative because the narrator who is anonymous remains 'outside' the fictional world, whereas the focalizer is 'within' the fictional world (if the novel is focalized through a single character as in James's *The Ambassadors* and *What Maisie Knew*). In such case, the former can only tell the story, but can not perceive or see (because s/he is not the participant within the fictional world), whereas the latter can only perceive the actions, or events as the participant within the fictional world, and as a result, can not narrate the story. Such narrator in third person narrative where he is not a character and remains 'out-side' the story is called a "heterodiegetic narrator" as in James's *The Ambassadors* and *What Maisie Knew* (*Narrative Discourse* 248).

Heterodiegetic narrator also can be either omniscient or limited one. The heterodiegetic narrator can tell the story either from his own perspective as in Leo Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, or from one character's perspective as in *The Ambassadors* or *What Maisie Knew*, from several character's perspective as in Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*. Such heterodiegetic narrator's gender is also not explicitly identified, s/he is an implied voice. Limited heterodiegetic narrator is not the member of the fictional world, therefore, s/he is not responsible for the image created in the fictional world as Richard Walsh says "Heterodiegetic narrator is not affected by the issue of unreliability because unreliability always requires characterization" (*Who is the Narrator?* 502). However, the narrator must be

distinguished from the focalizer who doesn't tell the story but through whose perspective situations, or events are filtered.

On the other hand, in first person narrative, the narrator himself can either be the major character or a minor character or just an observer. In such mode of narrative there is the possibility for the narrator to be both the centre of narration and centre of perception. Even in such situation when narrating and focalizing are taken up by the same agent, there is the gap between these two identities. As the centre of narration, s/he is present from the first word of the story to the last for being the narrator (when the text employs a single narrator) but as the centre of perception or focalization, s/he can focalize only what s/he can perceive. As the focalizer s/he has "restriction of field" or limitations in terms of distance of time or space. For example, there can be the difference between time of narration and time of focalization as Genette says, "Focalization through the hero is the restriction of field" (*Narrative Discourse* 194). So, it shows that quality and quantity of information or the image is determined by means of focalization. The narrator who has the status of character in the story is called a "homodiegetic narrator" (*Narrative Discourse* 248). According to their role in the narrative, there are various types of homodiegetic narrators. For instance, Magda and the Magistrate in Coetzee's *In the Heart of the Country* and *Waiting for the Barbarians* respectively, and Saleem in Rushdie's *The Midnight Children* being the character as well each of the homodiegetic narrator is responsible for the 'image'-reliable or unreliable created in the fictional world. Each of the homodiegetic narrator in these novels is the centre of narration and focalization both.

The above facts show that 'he who sees or perceives' can be 'he who speaks' (as in first person narrative), and 'he who speaks' can express the vision of 'he who sees' (as in the third person narrative). But there is not any compulsion that the one who speaks must perceive what others perceive and the one who perceives must speak. Let us suppose that X is the

narrator who can say what Y perceives without perceiving what Y perceives. Let us suppose again Y perceives Z. Here, X is not the person who can perceive Z because X is not the character; he can only speak about Y perception of Z. Y and Z are focalizer and focalized respectively, whereas X is just the speaker/narrator. Y doesn't narrate but X can say Y sees Z doing something. X can say about the relation between Y and Z through Y perspective.

So, Mieke Bal, one of the most influential post Genettean narratologists who clarifies Genettean focalization concept, defines focalization as the relationship between the focalizer and the focalized, the "subject" and the "object" of focalization:

Focalization is the relationship between the vision, the agent that sees, and that which is seen [...]. [As] the definition of focalization refers to a relationship, each pole of the relationship, the subject and the object of focalization, must be studied separately. The subject of focalization, the focalizer is the point from which the elements are viewed. That point lies with a character [. . .] or [with narrator] If the focalizer coincides with a character, [s/he] will have an advantage over the other characters. The reader watches with [his/her] eyes. (*Narratology* 146)

From this extract we come to know that the focalizer, s/he who perceives and the focalized, s/he or it who/which is perceived by the focalizer should be studied separately. The focalizer can give either reliable image or unreliable image of the focalizeds on the basis of his/her understanding, attitude, ideology, gender, race and other factors. As the focalizer is the centre or origin through whom the focalized (s) is/are focalized or perceived, it is he who is responsible for the image reliable or unreliable-created in the fictional world. His/her understanding can be either proper one or just (mis) understanding as well. Therefore, quality and quantity of information the text can provide is determined by the focalizer.

As the focalized doesn't have access to focalization and narrator is not the character in the fictional world (especially in the third person), it is neither narrator nor the focalized who can be responsible for the 'image' created in the novel or story. Readers are destined to see through the focalizer's eyes. We get the image of the focalizeds as well as that of himself through the focalizer's perspective as Bal further writes, "The image we receive of the object is determined by the focalizer. Conversely, the image a focalizer presents of an object says something about the focalizer (himself)" (Ball 50). Thus, focalizer is the agent through whose perspective the narrative is told, whereas the agents who/which are filtered through the consciousness of the focalizer are focalizeds. So, the story may be focalized through the perception of the narrator or character.

But there is not the compulsion that the thing which focalizer perceives must be perceived by the narrator as Seymour Chatman clearly differentiates focalizer from narrator in heterodiegetic narrative:

The narrator is a reporter, not an observer of the story world [...].It makes no sense to say that a story is told through the narrator's perception since s/he is precisely narrating, which is not an act of perception but of presentation or representation [. . .]. The heterodiegetic narrator never saw the event because s/he/it never occupied the story world.(*Chatman* 142-45)

Thus, from the above facts it is obvious that narrating and focalizing are two different instances. As these two instances were taken as the similar processes in the traditional narrative theories, the traditional theorist of point of view committed mimetic fallacy. It is only through the concept of focalization we can distinguish narrator from focalizer where the former is related to narrative voice, i.e. "enunciating" or "narrating", whereas the latter is related to narrative mood, i.e. an amount of "information available to the character through the acts of perception."

Therefore, Genette's differentiation of narration and focalization springs from the evident shortcomings or inconsistencies of the traditional point of view terminology as it tends to blur the issues in combining questions about the source of narration with those about the centre of perception/orientation. So Genette criticizes the traditional point of view theory for its:

regrettable confusion between [. . .] mood and voice, a confusion between the question who is the character whose point of view orients the narrative perspective? and the very different question who is the narrator? Or, more simply, the question who sees? and the question who speaks? (*Narrative Discourse* 186)

For this reason, he chides Friedman and Booth for "christening a narrator a focal character" (*Narrative Discourse Revisited* 64). Likewise, Mieke Bal Calls such preGenettean effort "non-sensical" (*Narratology* 143). In the above extract, 'he who speaks' is the narrator, whereas 'he who sees' is the focalizer or seer.

Another advantage of the term focalization is that it avoids the visual connotations of the terms like point of view, window, reflector, observer and others in pre-Genettean vision-centred point of view theory. For that reason Genette eventually replaces 'who sees?' with the broader issue 'who perceives?' in his *Narrative Discourse Revisited* as he says, "we must replace who sees? with the border question of who perceives[...]. It would be better to ask where is the focus of perception" (*Narrative Discourse Revisited* 64).

Therefore, crucial evidence for deciding who is focalizing is the presence or absence of verbs of experiencing such as 'look', 'see', 'touch', 'smell', 'think', 'dream' and others which are taken as perception in broad sense. It is clear that focalization is not limited to physical seeing in a narrow sense, but rather it has very broad area. So James's 'vision of narrators', 'reflectors', 'windows' and 'observers' are discarded for being too much 'metaphorical'. In

Gerald Prince's view Genette replaces Jamesian "vision centered poetics" by "texto-centered narratology" (qtd. in J Manfred Jahn 252).

Bal clarifies Genettean concept of perception as she writes, "Any act of perception presented in whatever form (narrated, reported, quoted or scenically represented) counts as a case of focalization" (qtd. in Jahn 251-52). In other word, every verb of perception indicates the activity of focalization. Further, she classifies focalizeds into two types: perceptible (P) and non-perceptible (NP).

Another Post-Genettean narratologist, Rimmon-Kenan does attempt the typology of what she calls " the facets of focalization variation-the major ones being perceptual, psychological and ideological" (*Narrative Fiction* 79-82). As per perceptual dimension of focalization, when the focalizer is the narrator himself, he can portray the holistic description of large scenes whereas if he is a character within the narrative, he can give a "limited view of that spatiotemporally limited observer" (qtd. in Michael Toolan 72). Kenan separates psychological variation to cognitive (internal focalizer's limited knowledge) and the emotive (emotions and feelings). In involved emotive focalization "scenes are represented in a noticeably idiosyncratic way" where the focalizer happens to do unexpected things because of his usual behaviour (qtd. in Toolan 73). Finally, her final facet of focalization variation ideological one, is related to explicit or implicit evaluation of different classes or genders or sexuality and others.

The narrator's choice of perspective or 'restriction of field' can be of three major types. In other words, focalization has been classified into three major types by Gerard Genette on the basis of the presentation of the focalizer(s), the centre of consciousness through whose perspective the events, thoughts or feelings are brought into focus: "zero/non focalization", "external focalization" and "internal focalization" (*Narrative Discourse* 189-90).

The narrative is said to be 'non-focalized' or 'narrative with zero focalization' when events are presented from a wholly unrestricted or omniscient point of view as in the 'classical narrative'. Its more familiar terminology is 'omniscient narration'. In such situation, the narrator will freely enter the minds and emotions of more than one of the characters. Zero focalization is the characteristic of 'traditional' or classical narration. For instance Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones* which employs omniscient narrator can be regarded as a text with non-focalized narrative or narrative with zero-focalization.

We can indicate an anonymous agent who is situated outside the story and is functioning as the focalizer by means of the term external focalization. Therefore, external focalization is always heterodiegetic, not homodiegetic. It is possible for the entire story to be focalized by external focalizer in the third person narrative. In the text with external focalization, the protagonist "performs in front of us without our ever being allowed to know his thoughts or feelings [as the narrator] doesn't tell us immediately all that he knows" (190). For instance in Ernest Hemingway's, *The Killers* and *Hills Like White Elephants*", the external focalizers tell us what the characters do but not what they think or perceive. In external focalization the viewpoint is outside the character depicted so that we are told only things which are external or observable or what characters say and do, these being things we would hear and see by ourselves if we were present at the scene depicted. In Bal's view the narrative in this mode can be objective because "the events are not presented from the point of view of the characters" (*Narratology* 149). She terms external focalization as non-character bound focalization or CF in short (Bal 148).

Such focalization is considered to be internal focalization when focalization lies with the character(s) which/who participate(s) in the story. In other words, presentation of events restricted to the perspective of one or more focal characters is known as internal focalization. Internal focalization concerns what the character(s) know(s) as it includes the characters'

perceptions or thoughts. Genette classifies internal focalization into three sub-types: "variable", "multiple" and "fixed internal focalization" (*Narrative Discourse* 189). In Bal's words, internal focalization can be termed as "character bound focalization" or "CF" in short (*Bal* 146).

When focalization or perspective alternates between several focal characters, it is called variable internal focalization. In other words, when the narrator employs variable focalization, focalization shifts from a character to another character(s). As a result, the thoughts, feelings, or perceptions of different characters can be known by using various eyes of those character so that it is supposed to be more reliable. For example in Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, the focal character is first Charles, then Emma, then again Charles.

When the author exploits multiple focalization, presentation of the same event(s) is seen through several focal characters. We may be provided a reliable image of the origins of a conflict as we are shown how differently the various characters see/view the same event(s), therefore, "this technique can result in neutrality towards all the characters" (Bal 148). In other words, if one of the focalizers is fallible, the other(s) may focalize correctly. For instance Robert Browning's narrative poem *The Ring and The Book* is the canonical example of this type of narrative. It relates a criminal case as perceived successively by the murderer, the victims, the defense and the prosecution.

Fixed focalization or fixed-character-bound focalization can be termed as "monofocalization" as well as it sticks to one of the characters as the only focalizer whose perspective determines the highly individualized orientation of the complete story. In other words, when the narrator deploys "fixed internal focalization", focalization is restricted to a single focal character. When the author deploys fixed or limited character focalization, there remains more possibility for the narrative to result into fallibility if the so-called focalizer is ignorant or self-justifying or biased or deceptive in the serious issues which are provided to

be 'manipulated' by him as in James's *What Maisie Knew*. However, this mode of focalization can be reliable as well as artistic as in Henry James's *The Ambassadors*.

When internal focalization is confined to a single character like Maisie's inner thoughts and feelings, it becomes very close to "interior monologue," the written representation of the character's inner thoughts impression and memories or "immediate speech" as if directly over-heard without the apparent intervention of summarizing and selecting narrator as in *What Maisie Knew* (*Narrative Discourse* 173). For instance in James's *The Ambassadors* "every thing passes through Strether", the only focalizer of the novel (*Narrative Discourse* 189). Readers are expected to use Strether's eyes to understand the events, feelings and thoughts in the novel but neither James's nor the narrator's perspective. In Genette's opinion such "restriction of field is particularly dramatic" because "the very principle of this narrative mode implies in all strictness that the focal character never be described or even referred to from outside, and that his thoughts or perception never be analyzed objectively by the narrator" (*Narrative Discourse* 189-92). So the narrative is filtered through the internal focalizer's perspective as in James's *The Ambassadors* and *What Maisie Knew*.

In such mode of narrative, neither the author nor the narrator can be responsible for the picture depicted in the novel. Rather the focalizer himself or herself is responsible for the image created. If the narrative is artistic or reliable, it is because of ability and impartiality of the focalizer as in *The Ambassadors*. If the narrative turns in to unreliability, it is because of inability or bias of the focalizer as in *What Maisie Knew*. So the image which the reader gets is fully coloured by the focalizer. Jonathan Culler has the similar opinion about the possibility for the narrative to be unreliable, "Unreliable [narrative] can result from limitation of point of view-when we gain a sense that the consciousness through which focalization occurs is unable or unwilling to understand the events" (*Literacy Theory* 90).

Therefore, modern narratological studies since Genette make use of the term and concept of focalization in order to differentiate the agent who narrates the events (narrator) from the agent who perceives the events (focalizer). So it implements its categorical distinction between who speaks and who sees to avoid the fallacy of treating character as narrator especially in third person narrative.

Chapter III

Analysis of Text

The Narrative Technique in Hemingway's *Across the River and into the Trees*

The narrative of *Across the River and into the Trees* is the narrative of Cantwell's understanding as he is the only focalizer of the novel. So, Hemingway presents Colonel's understanding pre- world war 'I' to post world war 'II' situation but not his understanding. In other words, as the fixed character focalizer of the entire novel, the narrative of *Across the River and into the Trees* is presented through the point of view or perspective of Cantwell alone, a fifty-year-old Colonel of the U.S. Army. On the other hand, his Countess Reneta is presented through Cantwell's perspective, is the focalized because she has less access to her own representation. As her representative the fixed focalizer Cantwell makes representation of (him) and other(s).

As Cantwell is the only focalizer, the person from whose perspective the events and character of the story are witnessed or perceived, everything in the narrative is filtered through his perception. All the focalized are brought into light neither by the author but by the focalizer Cantwell. The reader know about both the focalizer and the focalized as they have been evaluated or understood by the focalizer. So the heterodiegetic narrator narrates whatever gets filtered through the consciousness of the fixed focalizer Cantwell without his or her intervention. As always with Hemingway's fiction there is no identifiable authorial voice which can tell us whether Cantwell's evaluation is reliable or not. Therefore, it is Cantwell's understanding which the reader have access in the novel. Nevertheless, whatever images of (him) self and other (s) are created in the novel, it is he as the character- focalizer who is responsible. He can be reliable like the protagonist of *The Ambassadors's* Strether or unreliable like *Maisie* of *What Maisie Knew* written by Henry James. In other words, the

fixed internal focalizer is responsible for the reliability or unreliability of the narrative because of the absence of authorial judgement.

Being the fixed focalizer, the focalizers not only the outward or physical perception, i.e. what he sees through his eyes or what he hears but also inward perception like what he 'speculates', 'thinks', 'assumes', 'feels', 'believes' visualizes', 'remembers' and 'dreams'. Moreover, he focalizes what others might think, feel and believes as the representative of others as he thinks about Reneta's feeling " 'she is forgotten', the Colonels said. And, strangely enough, she was. It was strange because she had been present in the room for a moment, and she had very nearly caused panic (156)." In such situation, when focalization becomes inward perception of character, it becomes very close to interior monologue.

Fixed internal focalizer, being the only focalizer of the narrative is expected to be an understanding person who should have impartial relation with the focalizeds so that he can give the reliable image of the focalized, "The girl Reneta that you are, is sleeping now without ever having done anything to her hair. She is sleeping with it spread out on the pillow and all it is to her is a glorious (131)". On the other hand, if s/he cannot understand focalized, because of his/her ignorance, the narrative is doomed to provide unreliable or fallible image in absence of the authorial evaluation. We should not forget the important fact that the focalizer's ideology, based on his race gender and sexuality may colour his/her focalization. So, quality and quantity of information is determined by the fixed focalizer.

We can notice the presence of verbs of perception such as 'look', 'see' 'touch', 'smell', 'think' 'feel', and 'dream' for the only focalizer of *Across the River and into the Trees* Cantwell, therefore we are destined to see through his 'eyes' which is widely used as metaphor in this novel. However, such verbs of perception are denied to the focalizeds. So Cantwell 'sees' or 'perceives' them doing something.

The narrative of *Across the River and into the Trees* not only introduces Cantwell as a fixed internal focalizer but also keeps a distance between limited heterodiegetic narrator and the fixed character focalizer, Cantwell which is clear even the first paragraph of the novel, "The shooter sat on a shooting stool fastened to the top of a box that contained his lunch and shells, and the shooter's two, or more, guns were propped against the load of wooden decoys(1) . It is Cantwell himself who thinks so; it is neither the perception of the author nor that of the narrator.

Though the question of the focalizer and the focalizeds remains enigmatic on the surface level, Hemingway gives a rhetorical signal to the canny reader in the deep level by presenting his fixed internal focalizer ironically, and as a result distancing the author from the focalizer. As a result, implied meaning of the novel has to be just the opposite of the surface.

Across the River and into the Trees, of which Hemingway thought very highly, is an impressive narrative gimmick rather than an effective novel. The novel is cast in the usual circular mould, beginning and ending with a duck-shoot, which gives the false impression of two different duck shoots. It is only one duck-shoot and the intervening two hundred and twenty five pages make up an uninterrupted interior monologue during which the shooter recreates in his mind not only the actual events of the last two days, Friday and Saturday, since the medical exam on Thursday, but also the particular memories which had concerned him during those two days.

This accounts for the singularity of the novel. The novel begins with fixed internal focalization, with the action viewed from the Colonel's point of view for the most part. We can say that only the short first chapter and the last thirty pages originate in an heterodiegetic

narrator, who occasionally tells us, especially in the last chapter of things the Colonel cannot know, is not correct. The heterodiegetic narrators' intrusion in the rest of the book are not only frequent, but mostly unnecessary. For instance, when Colonel Cantwell looks at his face in the mirror, it is the heterodiegetic narrator that comments:

He did not notice the old used steel of his eyes, nor that small, long extending laugh wrinkles at the corners of his eyes, nor that his broken nose was like a gladiators in the oldest statues. Nor did he notice his basically kind month which could be truly ruthless. (82)

But there are authorial intrusions of worse kind in the novel which the author speaks directly to the reader in a figurative style as follows: "'Have to?' the Colonel said and the cruelty and resolution showed in his strange eyes as clearly as when the hooded muzzle of the gun of a tank swings towards you"(105). The focalization in such a case is, as we rightly observe, outside the narrative, and whether you like or dislike the simile, its effects is one of distraction. The Colonel is not looking at his reflection in mirror here and so cannot have seen the cruelty and resolution in his eyes. These are the words of the intrusive commentator who wants to enlighten the reader about some aspects of the Colonel's personality. The reader's knowledge and appreciation of a character which should be built up impression by impression through action, dialogue and monologue by a subtle manipulation of the focalization, suffers greatly from these unwarranted authorial intrusions.

The story between the duck-shoot of the first chapter and the duck-shoot at the end of the novel is not an "interior monologue" as critics call it, but a flash-back in the heterodiegetic oblique method, with the omniscient narrator's voice being occasionally heard.

The use of the third-person narrator who projects point of view which, though for the most part identical with the Colonel's, is occasionally independent of and slightly above his, makes it impossible for us to consider it as an interior monologue. Besides the flash-back

contains long accounts of the Colonel's war-memories as told to Renata and they would look absurd in an interior-monologue being twice removed from the time of the action in the novel. There is no textual support, we can say that the novel is really a homodiegetic narration of events in the past like *The Sun Also Rises* and *Farewell to Arms*, but disguised as heterodiegetic narration through the device of using the shooter as a 'focal' through whom the Colonel thinks about himself.

In the duck-shoot of the opening chapter we find a lack of understanding between the shooter and the boatman and we know the reason for the boatman's hostile attitude only when the duck-shoot is over in Chapter 43, and Baron Alvarito explains that the boatman is allergic to Allied uniforms as his wife and daughter were raped by the Moroccans. When we come to the end of the first chapter, we know only that the shooter is angry with the boatman but controls himself: "Every time you shoot now can be the last shoot and no stupid son of bitch should be allowed to ruin it. Keep your temper, boy, he told himself" (5). The next chapter opens with the heterodiegetic narrative telling the story of the shooter:

But he was not a boy. He was fifty and a Colonel of Infantry in the Army of the United States and to pass a physical examination that he had to take the day before he came down to Venice for this shoot, he had taken enough mannitol hexanitrate to, well he did not quite know what to—to pass, he said to himself.(6)

The point of view is clearly established here as the heterodiegetic omniscient narrator's. In the next chapter, it slips into the 'oblique' which is maintained, for the most part, in the subsequent chapters until it is resumed by the omniscient narrator at the end when the Colonel dies:

That was the last thing Colonel ever said. But he made the back seat all right and he shut the door. He shut it carefully well. After a while Jackson drove the

car down the ditch and willow lined road with the car's big lights on, [. . .]

'They'll return them all right, through channels', Jackson thought, and put the car in the gear. (224-225)

The subject of the novel is Colonel Cantwell's last visit to Venice, the city he loves most, and his preparedness for death, which comes at the end of his visit. He visits Venice for the duck-shoot and for a meeting with Countess Renata, his nineteen-year old beloved, and his old friends. The duration of the visit is two days for, or to be exact, less than two days for, at the end, the early darkness of the second day begins. The story of visit begins two hours before daylight on the first day and ends, perhaps an hour or two after daylight fades on the second day. But when we include the Colonel's medical examination the time of action will be three days. It starts with the Colonel giving death and ends with his taking death. There is an attempt at observing the three classical unities in a greater measure than in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. The new techniques of alternating memory with actual experience, shifting of points of view, flash-back, time shifts, circular structure and interior monologue, which have been repeatedly used since *The Snows of Kilimanjaro* are used in the novel.

The actual experience, in the flash-back narration, is the Colonel's visit to Venice and his meeting with his beloved Renata. The memories deal with his experiences in the Second World War-"the sad science of soldiering". He feels better, "purging" his bitterness as he tells Renata about the war. Throughout, he makes a conscious efforts to get the better of his temper, to be understanding, forgiving and kind. He tries to convert his disappointment into a positive effort to satisfy and please Renata. They both know that the Colonel's end is near and their last meeting, while it brings a serious disappointment, reveals the selfless love of the Colonel who finds his pleasure only in giving it to Renata. But the alteration of memory with actual experience, which contributes to the emotional rhythm of *The Snow of Kilimanjoro* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, does not achieve any purpose here and the

memories tend to weary the reader(researcher) though they do not bore Renata. Some of them may have great personal poignancy for the Colonel, but, as he goes on recapitulating them, they lose that poignancy for the researcher.

The most intriguing part of it comes when the Colonel continues his narration even when Renata is asleep. The whole narration of his war memories seems to be ironic and sequel to his knowledge of “How boring any man’s war is to any other man, and he stopped talking about it” (16). These reflection on the war together with the occasional quotation from or allusion to literature and art serve only to show off the Colonel’s knowledge and test, if not the author's. He sounds like a war-veteran being interviewed, rather than like a lover recounting some of his experiences to his beloved. The style is unnecessarily figurative at places and there is monotony about the way the figurative expressions are used.

She turned her head and raised her chin, without vanity, nor coquetry, and the Colonel felt his heart turn over inside him, as though some sleeping animal had rolled over in its burrow and frightened, deliciously, the other animal sleeping close beside.(61)

This Homeric simile comes out elsewhere, like the strange animal coming out at another opening of the burrow in the following sentence:

'I understand ', the *Gran Maestro* said and he looked at Renata and his heart rolled over as a porpoise does in the sea. It is beautiful movement and only a few people in this world can feel it and accomplish it.

'What do you want to eat, Daughter,?' the Colonel asked, looking at her early morning, unretouched dark beauty.

Everything.(148)

This kind of writing is a violation of Hemingway's own theory and practice as a writer. The Colonel and Renata sound not only unconvincing but amusing, as they discuss war in the bed from chapter 27 to chapter 36.

The oblique point of view which is employed in the flash-back narration is not shifted to the heterodiegetic at the end of the flash-back when the duck-shoot is resumed, and the Colonel's point of view is maintained almost till the end and is changed only when the Colonel dies. Besides, there is a brief flash-back, again, about how the Colonel punished the two sailors, who whistled Renata, in the course of the resumed duck-shoot. It is this inartistic manipulation of the point of view that confuses the reader and clouds the fact that the actual action of the novel is the duck-shoot followed by the Colonel's death and the rest of the story is only a flash-back.

Across the River and into the Trees is flawed in lesser respects too. We know that the Colonel is perfectionist who does everything carefully and well including the shutting of the car door before his death. But when Andrea is described in the same way we are perplexed:

He turned his fine, long, tall back on them and looked into the mirror that is placed behind bars so a man can tell when he is drinking too much, and decided that he did not like what he saw there, 'Ettore', he said. 'Please put this nonsense on my bill. He walked out after waiting carefully for his coat, swinging into it, and tipping the man who brought it exactly what he should be tipped plus twenty percent. (60)

Andrea seems to mimic the Colonel here, but that is not likely, since the voice is the heterodiegetic narrator's and there is no suggestion of mimicry. It is obvious that Hemingway confuses Andrea with Cantwell.

In Page 60, the Colonel asks Renata her age and she replies, "Nearly nineteen, Why? " In Page 71, during the course of the same chapter the Colonel repeats the same question:

'How old are you?'

'I will be nineteen'.

'How do you know this?'

'I know it from the Gondoliere. (71)

It is not probable that the Colonel, who is presented as extremely correct in doing things could be guilty of such a mistake or that Renata does not draw his attention to it in that event.

We can notice the narrative technique of *The Old Man and the Sea* and *Across the River and into the Trees*, which was torn to pieces by researchers, and Hemingway's own description of it as his calculus, comments: " It is not safe to dismiss such a statement (that he had moved into calculus) as simply pretensions"(Ben Stoltzfos 10). Years before, when he wrote of the fourth and fifth dimension that had something in mind. Perhaps some day it can be shown how the calculus, which is often described as a symbolic means of grasping the fleeting instant, throws a more attractive light on the novel than has yet been observed.

Across the River and into the Trees demonstrates an obvious attempt at grasping the fleeting instant. The novel is in a way, an enlargement of the colonel's fleeting impression of his two day visit to Venice in the midst of his deck-shoot. The author who is conscious of Othello parallels might have in mind the fleeting instant before Othello's death when his memory recaptures for a moment all the romance and tragedy of life. The novel is an attempt at catching hold of such a fleeting instant before the Colonel's death and working back toward a narrative pattern involving the preceding two days and the memories generated during those two days. The ambitious symbolic construct, "When lilacs last in the door-yard bloomed. And out of the cradle endlessly rocking and come and get it, you son of bitches or I'll throw it away"(154), verging on the allegorical, " Better to live one day as a lion than a hundred years as a sheep"(29), which he builds upon the narrative with Dantesque overtones , "Dante was

another 'vieuxcon' the Colonel said. "I mean as a man .Not as a writer" (66), and Christological references, "oh Christ, he said, I wonder what she looks like now sleeping. I know how she looks, he said to himself, wonderful " (125), adds a new dimension to the novel. But since the basic aspect of emotional appeal suffers on account of the many defects in the narrative, the symbolism does not have the desired effect.

The title derives from Stonewall Jackson's words before his death and sounds slightly ironical as the Colonel who does everything " Carefully and well" repeats the words, " Let us cross over the river and rest under the shade of trees"(224). He shares the General's ill-health and badly injured right hand, and for him it is, " across the canal and into the car" as he says," Good, I'm now going to get into the large back seat of this god-damned, over-sized luxurious automobile"(224).

We can say that an important feature of this novel is the narrative focus which is on the Colonel from beginning to end. It is not shifted even for a moment.

The Colonel whispered; holding her tight, and with his heart broken, honestly and fairly, in his whisper that was as barely audible as a silent dog whistle heard close to the ear, 'I love you, devil. And you're my daughter, too. And I don't care about our losses because the moon is our mother and our father.

And now lets go down to dinner.(84)

The narrative situation is reduced to the simplest terms, and the protagonist is the only character who counts and his mind becomes a kind of stage, as when the Colonel's mind briefly becomes the scene of dialectic between fun and love. This dialectic is taken up one hundred pages later, when the Colonel reveals the supreme secret of the mysterious order to Renata:

'Proceed to reveal', the Gran Maestro said.

'I proceed to reveal', the Colonel said.' Listen Carefully Daughter. This is the supreme Secret. Listen." Love is love and fun is fun. But it is always so quiet when the gold fish die."

'It has been revealed', the Gran Maestro said. (198).

The Colonel, who is the supreme commander of the order, has had his share of fun as seen in his activities in Venice including the duck-shoot and learnt his lesson in love as revealed in his relations with Renata," I'd rather not love anyone, the Colonel thought. I'd rather have fun and fun, his good side said to him. You have no fun when you do not love"(53), and what remains now is that he should die a quiet and graceful death. This technique of uninterrupted narrative focus on a single character is the main essence of Hemingway's narrative technique.

The main criticism of the novel is its deficiency in narrative and emotional intensity owing to the fact that a large chunk of the novel is recollected action wrapped in a flash-back. This divests the events of their emotional quality and what remains is a lyrical, literary style bordering on sentimentality at times. The Colonel's forgiveness of the boatman even before learning of his "over-liberation" by the allies, which from part of the main action of the story, points to the central paradox of the Colonel's sexual disappointment resulting in a triumph of love and compassion. At one level the Colonel fails to find fulfillment in his life. Renata disappoints him in a way; and his duck-shoot is spoiled by the boatman. But at another level, more important because subjective, he has no regrets at the time of death. In fact, his feeling is one of fulfillment:" Three strikes is out, he thought, and they gave me four. I've always been a lucky son of a bitch" (224).

Dramatization of love and death with especial relation to narrative technique:

Like most of Hemingway's novels, *Across the River and into the Trees* is rich in references to poets, dramatists, and other writers, but in this novel the emphasis falls

consistently on their anomalous love affairs and not, as is usually the case, on their art. By placing his own affair in the context of these other, stranger relationships, Cantwell minimizes its imbalances. Thus, Cantwell refers to Robert Browning and Elizabeth Barrett Browning not as a single poet but as a couple, recalling the dashing, handsome young man who chose a sickly oldwife. Cantwell's reference to Byron recalls not his poetry or his military adventures, but his many adulterous affairs, including those with a gondolier's wife and with Teresa Guiccioli, herself married to a much older man. We have noticed Cantwell's frequent references to himself as Mister Dante, with Renata playing the role of younger Beatrice.

'I dare say that makes marvelous reading'

'I dare say', Ettore said. 'But it was hardly the method of Dante'.

'Dante was another *Vieux con*'. the Colonel said. 'I mean as a man. Not as a writer.'

'I agree'. Ettore said. 'I think you will find no one, outside of Firenze, who has studied his life who would not agree'.

'Eff Florence', the Colonel said.(66)

Even Rimbaud and Verlaine are recalled, and certainly, many elements of Verlaine's life-his unhappy marriage, his passionate attachment to teen-aged lover, and the lack of recognition which attended his work for most of his life-are relevant to Cantwell's situation, although the storminess of that homosexual relationship makes Renata and Cantwell seem like a staid, even boring couple.

Cantwell and Renata repeatedly exalt their own love story not only by comparing themselves to scandalous historical and fictional couples, but by insisting on their own moral superiority to them. In the process, they reveal their own (or perhaps their author's) middle-class values. We read, for example, that Renata, who bargains for the jeweled pin which she wants Cantwell to buy for her, is less extravagant and therefore more virtuous than Marie

Antoinette, and that Cantwell, who would "Still be able to spit" in the face of death, is braver than Louis XVI (196). Similarly, Cantwell refers to Othello and Desdemona, who reflect his and Renata's situation rather closely, but he finds that Renata is "better looking than Desdemona and he himself is braver, more experienced, and more modest than the garrulous Moor"(168). Obviously, for a person who subscribes to such gender stereotypes the need to legitimize what would be seen as an unconventional liaison must be very strong. The attempt to present Cantwell and Renata as respectable members of the middle class is emphasized by her plans for a trip through the American countryside during which they will visit national parks and :

Will we stop early in the afternoons at the best Motel in the A.A.A. book and I make you any drinks you want while you read the paper and life and *Time* and *Newsweek*, and I will read the new fresh *Vogue* and *Harper's Bazaar*?

'Yes, But we come back here too.' (192)

Himself a soldier, the Colonel refers to the romances of historical as well as fictional military men and, not surprisingly, all of them are more unconventional than his own. General Custer's wife for example, refused the traditional wifely role and, instead of staying home, accompanied her husband on many of his frontier expedition; she wrote five books about their experiences. It is interesting that Cantwell does not consider her a liability in the all male military world; instead, he praises her as a "a loving wife" (103). Another famous military figure, the dashing Gabriele d' Annunzio, is also mentioned in connection with his lover, the actress Eleanora Duse. These two were defiantly unmarried, but their relationship was so intense and artistically productive that they have won historical acceptance as a couple. Even more extravagant is the story of Liver Eating Johnston, an Army Scout who married a Chinook wife. When she was killed by Crow Indians, Johnston vowed to kill as many Crows as he could find and eat their livers, a feat he is said to have performed upon as

many as 250 or 300 Crows. Even this peculiar story has the comforting, traditional ending of comedy: Johnston and the Crows were reconciled; he was adopted into their tribe; and a harmonious social order established. Alerted by Anna and Brusadelli and by Renata and Cantwell, we notice not only that the novel is full of dramatic love stories and unusual or mismatched lovers, but that all of them have somehow or other been incorporated into the social fabric. Soon in this way, the novel is practically an apologia for unconventional love. In the conservative atmosphere of the 1950s, such a defense is appropriate for Cantwell.

Although few of us admire Cantwell but we should not dismiss. It is remarkably communicative document. *Across the River and into the Trees* contains many narrative techniques: there are the frame story (the unproductive duck hunt, the only part of the novel which takes place in present time), and the embedded Renata-Cantwell Chapters (the last few days of their doomed love affairs, as recalled by Cantwell), and, moving further into the past, an important third structure, technique or layer: the vivid but unspoken account of the disasters, national and private, of Hurtgenwald. To this triple-tiered, inverted pyramid, Hemingway adds yet another layer. By means of a network of even more deeply embedded stories, he presents the psychological defenses with which Cantwell attempts to protect and justify himself. These defensive stories are not only unspoken (as the Hurtgenwald narrative is unspoken) but untold: only the historical names associated with the stories appear in the novel.

A New Dialogue: Hemingway's Legacy:

The principle of economy and understatement and the use of colloquial speech rhythms control Hemingway's dialogue. The old habit of underlining the intent or emotion or intonation of the speaker began to be discarded by Mark Twain and Henry James. Hemingway carries this process to its logical conclusion making the dialogue completely dramatic with no commentary from the author except where it is absolutely needed. The verb

most commonly used is "said", and for them "asked". No substitute is generally used for them to indicate shades of intention or feeling, unless it is absolutely required in *Across the River and into the Trees*:

'Now', the girl said.' We are in our home and I love you. Please kiss me and put all love into it.'

The Colonel held her close, with her head thrown back and kissed her until there was nothing left of the kiss but desperation.

'I love you'

'Whatever that means', she interrupted.

'I love you and I know whatever that means. The picture is lovely. But there is no word for what you are'.

'Wild?' She said, or careless or unkempt?

'No'. (111)

Hemingway's dialogues speak of the author's sensitive ear for the accents, inflexions, mannerism, and emotional connotations of human speech. At the same time, the dialogue is not a mere transcription of human speech and, in Philip Young's words, gives "an illusion of reality that, in its completeness, reality itself does not give" (*Reconsideration*, 205). Just as art, which is imitation of life, is at the same time more than a mere imitation, dialogue in a work of art also is more than a mere imitation of human conversation, while being basically an imitation of it. The important thing is the illusion the artist creates in his fictional world of people talking, for which the conversation should be convincing. It is said that Hemingway, after finishing his day's work, read it over to anyone who can be pressed into service—either his wife or a guest, asking now and then "That sound right? Hit your ear right? People talk that way?" (*Sem Boal's Account* qtd. by John Atkins 67). Henry James's motto, "Dramatize, Dramatize", is perhaps, nowhere illustrated better than in Hemingway's fiction, especially

some of his novels like *Across the River and into the Trees*. The following dialogue demonstrates how far Hemingway dramatizes his dialogue:

'Please darling', the girl said. ' I don't think I can stand it'.

'Don't think of anything. Don't think of anything at all.'

'I'm not.'

'Don't think'

'Oh please let's not talk'.

'It is right?'

'You know.'

'You're sure'.

'Oh please not talk, please?'

'Yes, he thought, Please and please again.' (113)

The clipped dialogue expresses the emotional tension underlying the words better than if it were expressed in a conventional way. It necessitates a greater amount of concentration on the reader's part for even the introductory "said" is dropped. But its disadvantage is that at some point, if the mind should wander, it would be difficult to the speaker unless we go back again. The dialogue cited above, there is a clash between what the man (Colonel) wants and the girl (Renata) wants. The girl wants to have something which the man does not want. The man loves her and does not want her to do anything she does not want to do. This is the basic situation, a clash of desires and emotions between a man and a girl who are united by love. This strange situation is brought forth by the interactive pattern in which they use almost the same vocabulary, with only the affirmative and negative variations. At last we can say that the interactive technique in dialogue is used with advantage. Though in different ways, by other writers also like Joyce, James, Stein and Sherwood Anderson.

The Cult of Simplicity:

The cult of simplicity is not a novelty in English prose. The authorized version of the Bible has set the pace for it as well as for concreteness and speed in narrative technique. Jonathan Swift made a minimal use of simile or metaphor as early as in the eighteenth century, as figures of speech could interfere with the directness of the narrative technique. Hemingway belongs to this stylistic tradition of simplicity. But he adheres to simplicity and concreteness more rigidly than Swift or Bunyan does. His preference for concrete words, unencumbered by merely decorative qualifiers, intensifiers and figures of speech, can be seen in the following passage from *Across the River and into the Trees* in which a highly dramatic situation is presented:

He saw, too, that she was the portrait of his own true love, and so he said, 'I am sorry for all the stupidity I say. I do not wish ever to be brutal. May be we could both sleep a little while, with luck, and then perhaps, your Mistress would call on the telephone?'

May be she will even call, he thought. (128)

Here is no effort to introduce emotion, but only a bare action, picture of what happened-the picture which is the formula of the emotion one feels. The simplest possible words are used. The passage being an action-picture, the verb is the important word, the basic sentence is the declarative simple sentence.

IN THE EVENT OF MY DEATH THE WRAPPED PAINTING AND THE TWO SHOTGUNS IN THIS CAR WILL BE RETURNED TO THE HOTEL RITTI VENICE WHERE THEY WILL BE CLAIMED BY THEIR RIGHTFUL OWNER SIGNED RICHARD CANTWELL. (225)

The absence of punctuation, capital words and the coordinate "and" help in leading the reader from one picture to another without any pause until the whole picture hangs as one unit. The copula is the non-interfering commentator's voice, now reduced to the minimum.

The picture is simply presented one by one without any commentary on their relative importance and without subordinating one image to another. "And" helps in this kind of presentation which frequently is of the nature of cinematography. Joseph Warren Beach terms this "The great leveling democracy of the 'And'" (*Aesthetics of Simplicity* 101).

Harry Levin calls attention to Hemingway's "verbal skepticism" ("Observation on the Style of Ernest Hemingway", *Kenyon Review* XIII [Autumn 1951] 592), his distrust of words which leads to a kind of moral nihilism. Hemingway's own remark to the Colonel Cantwell that "Everyone knows everything"(55). The artistry Hemingway displays in using words and the emotions he evokes by using a word, or by not using a word sometimes, reveal his faith in the magic power of the word and *Across the River into the Trees* is a good example.

The Technique of Repetition:

Repetition as a stylistic device is used to the maximum advantage by Hemingway in *Across the River into the Trees*. The popular view that he imbibed it from Gertrude Stein and James Joyce is disproved by his juvenilia of the Oak Park days (*Supra* 7). This narrative technique could be traced back to his freshman text of *Old Testament Narratives*.

Hemingway captures the incantatory effect of the repetition of "and" so profusely used in Bible, especially in the Old Testament. It transforms language into a kind of verbal ritual, completely in keeping with the ritualistic action with its emphasis on the form-doing things carefully, correctly as if the form were everything. Ritual is formal homage or worship or glorification. The ever-lasting earth and the great stream representing nature and the flux of life, against which man cannot prevail, draw homage from Hemingway, and the ritualistic style is the form this homage seems to take.

Apart from its Dantesque metaphor which has a religious tinge of its own, *Across the river and into the Trees* has a biblical hue too. The Colonel's last three days are packed with love and forgiveness-love for Venice, for Renata, for Gran Maestro, and for everybody he

meets and everything he touches, and forgiveness of the boatman who offends him.

Hemingway writes:

Oh Christ, he said, I wonder what she looks like now sleeping. I know how she looks, he said to himself. Wonderful. She sleeps as though she had not gone to sleep. As though she were just resting. I hope she is, he thought. I hope she's resting well. Christ Jesus how I love her and I hope. I never do her harm.(125)

Renata is a religious symbol in *Across the River and into the Trees* emphasizes the significance of this novel as a turning point in Hemingway's symbolistic techniques of repetition. The heroine's name suggests the Virgin Mary. Colonel's one bad hand which Renata loves much and prefers to the other hand, and which he uses to satisfy her while foregoing his own sexual fulfillments, is like the nailed hand of Jesus and shows the Christological element in him.

Analyzing critically in *Across the River and into the River* we can discover many techniques such as impressionistic method, depiction of sensations, foreign idiom, but the above critical analysis is only focused on narrative technique. Thus, *Across the River and into the Trees* has all the characteristics of Hemingway's narrative technique. At last, we can say that this is Hemingway's great contribution to the craft of fiction i.e. narrative technique.

Chapter - IV

Conclusion

Ernest Hemingway, whose narrative technique is the subject of this research, is, like James and Conrad before him a conscious artist, who has thought deeply about his aesthetic conviction, and learnt his technique the hard way. It is his narrative skill which has earned for him the Pulitzer Prize in 1953 and the Nobel Prize in 1954 and a permanent place among the great writers of the world.

He is the finest flower of the fictional, narratological (i.e. narrative technique) tradition. His basic objective is, as he himself makes clear in many of his utterances and writing, truthful writing of what really happens in action. His narrative technique, made to suit this end, evinces a scrupulous selection of detail, involving rejection of what is not essential and an evocative skill in the employment of words, both of which are found in James's work. The interior monologue of the stream-of-consciousness method also finds a proper place in his narrative technique. His method of narrative in *Across the River and into the Trees* is dramatic in that he "shows" rather than "tells" his story like Jane Austen and Henry James.

A metaphysical interest in man and his relation to nature and the ultimate truths engages his attention as it has engaged the attention of his great predecessors in the American tradition, like Hawthorne, Melville, Mark Twain, and Poe. This gives his novel *Across the River and into the Trees* the hue of romance, leading to the use of myth, symbolism, time shifts, circular structure, and stylistic experimentation as effective techniques of narration. He follows the method of Henry James in his own way in *Across the River and into the Trees*. The technique of dramatic correlative, used by Stephen Crane in showing an association between the external circumstances and man's mind and emotions, is liberally, and with great advantage, employed by Hemingway in *Across the River and into the Trees*. His use of

American and his undisguised efforts to revitalize the narrative technique and give it a new force and purpose remind us of Henry James.

The fact that some of Hemingway's methods are adumbrated in some earlier English and American works only underlines the growth of narrative tradition of which Hemingway's *Across the River and into the Trees* represents the high-water-mark..

As the narrative of *Across the River and into the Trees* is presented the perspective of Cantwell, protagonist cum fixed internal focalizer of the novel. It is Cantwell who understands the pre-World War I to post-World War II situation. Being the only focalizer of the novel every events and characters are filtered through his consciousness. Therefore, it is neither the author Hemingway nor the heterodiegetic anonymous narrator who is responsible for the images created in the novel. The focalizer evaluates himself as a lover, responsible Colonel and a helpful-cheerful person, whereas, the focalized- Countess Reneta is evaluated as selfless and freshness of love she is offering to Cantwell. In other words, the focalization based on Cantwell's understanding presents as a reliable Colonel. However, there is equal possibility for the focalizer to either reliable as Strether or unreliable like Maisie. So, the image of both focalizer and the focalized remains difficult to understand because we can't claim whether Cantwell, the focalizer and the focalized are as they are understood by the focalizer or not; we can't claim whether it is the understanding of only the focalizer or it is the understanding of both Cantwell and Hemingway. It is because there is the absence of authorial or narratorial evaluation on the focalizer's understanding and portrayal of the focalizer.

The novel has the usual circular structure, beginning and ending with a duck-shoot in Venice. The narrative technique begins and ends as an omniscient third person narrative with the action viewed from the Colonel's point of view which reads, for the most part, like a fifty-year-old Colonel's sentimental account of his return to the city he fought for and loved.

Throughout his narration, Cantwell describes military blunders and stupidity of superiors who were responsible for the death of many soldiers. Cantwell is an experienced strategist who loves history, literature and art Hemingway describes events, places, and people using an allusive vocabulary that does not theorize. His narrative forces the reader to connect the parts by analyzing the poetic resonance of the floating signifiers. Hemingway walks the reader to the bridges that he or she must cross alone without the narrator's help.

Hemingway's narrative technique is constructed stone by stone and the different pieces of its structure, like Venice or St. Mark's, articulate his writing and its calculus. Each narrative technique fits into the other as different building blocks dovetail into the architectural whole. Hemingway's narrative technique is always a clean, well-lighted place, a technique of the carefully selected minimum; this led him to a style of pure narration that at its best made him into an experimenter with the experience and form of his time. So, from the study of narrative technique, Hemingway's narrative technique is a life where romantic feelings and pains are kept half-hidden, contained by an exact language. Thus, it can be said that Hemingway's narrative technique is an equation that conflates the past and the present into timelessness that dramatizes love and death.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of literary Terms*. 7th ed. Delhi: Harcourt India, 2001.
- Aristotle, "Poetics". *Critical Theory since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992. 50 - 60.
- Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. 2nd ed. Toronto: university of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Baldick, Chris. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Beach, Joseph Warren. "Point of View". *The Methods of Henry James*. Philadelphia: Albert Saifer, 1954. 56 - 71.
- Booth, Wayne C. "The Rhetoric of Fiction". *Narratology*. Ed. Susana Onega, et. al. London and New York: Longman, 1996. 145 - 54.
- . *The Twentieth century Novel: Studies in Techniques*. Ludhiana: Lyall Book Depot, 1965.
- . "Distance and Point of View". *Essay in Criticism*. 11(1961): 60-79.
- Brooks, Cleanth and Robert Penn Warren. *Understanding Fiction*. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1965.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. New York: Cronell University Press. 1978.
- Cowley, Malcom. *Nightmare and Ritual in Hemingway: Twentieth Century Views*. Ed. Robert P. Weeks. Englewood: Prentic Hall, 1962.
- Culler, Jonathan. "Narrative" *Literary Theory: A very Short Introduction*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 82 - 93.

- Donaldson, Scott. *The Cambridge Companion to Ernest Hemingway*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Elliott, Emory. *Columbia Literary History of the United States*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- - -. *The Columbia History of American Novel*. New York: CUP, 1991.
- Forster, E.M. *Aspects of the Novel*. London: Penguin, 1927.
- Friedman, Norman. "Point of View in Fiction". *PMLA* 70.5 (1955): 1160-1184.
<<http://www.jstor.org>>.
- Hart, James D. *The Oxford Companion to American Literature*. New York: OUP, 1983.
- High, Peter B. *An Outline of American Literature*. London and New York: Longman, 1986.
146 - 150.
- James, Henry. *The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces*. Ed. R. P. Blackmur. Boston: North Eastern University Press, 1934.
- John, Manfred. "Frames, Preferences, and the Reading of Third Person Narratives: Towards a Cognitive Narratology." *Poetics Today* 18.4 (1997) 495-514.
<<http://www.jstor.org/>>.
- Lubbock, Percy. *The Craft of Fiction*. Bombay: BI Publications, 1979.
- Meredith, James Howard. "The Rapido River and Hurtgen Forest in *Across the River and into the Trees*." *The Hemingway Review* 14.1 (1994) 60-70.
<<http://www.galenet.com>>
- Mundel, Miriam B. "*Across the River and into the Trees*: Reading the Brusadelli Stories." *Journal of Modern literature* 19.2 (1995): 334-345 <<http://www.jstor.org>>.
- Morphet, Tony. "Stranger Fictions". *World Literature Today* 70.1 (1996): 53 -59
<<http://www.proquest.com>>.

- Onega, Susana et. al. eds. *Narratology: An Introduction*. London and New York: Longman, 1996.
- Plato. "Republic". *Critical Theory since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992. 23 - 31.
- Paul Robert. "Hemingway and the Creation of Twentieth Century Dialogue." *Twentieth Century literature* 42.4 (1996):453-480. <<http://www.jstor.org>>.
- Raw, P. G Rama. *Ernest Hemingway*. New Delhi: S. Chand, 1979.
- Rimmon Kenan, S. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London: Methuen, 1983.
- Ruland, Richard and Malcolm Bradbury. *From Puritanism to Postmodernism*. New York: Penguin, 1992, 302-309.
- Scholes, Robert and Robert Kellogg. "Point of View in Narrative" *The Nature of Narrative*. London and New York: OUP, 1976. 240 - 282.
- Stoltzfus, Ben. "The Stone of Venice. Time and Remembrance: Calculus and Proust in *Across the River and into the Trees*." *The Hemingway Review* 22.2 (2003) 13 - 20 <<http://www.lgalenet.com>>.
- Toolan, Michael J. "The Articulation of Narrative Text: Time, Focalization and Narration." *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995. 47 - 89.
- Verduin, Kathieen. "Hemingway's Dante: A Note on *Across the River and into the Trees*": *American Literature* 57.4 (1985)633-640 <<http://www.jstor.org>>.
- Wagher, Martina Linda. *The Modern American Novel 1914-1965: A Critical History*. New York: Macmillan, 1989.
- Wakeman, John. *Twentieth Century Writers*. New York: Oxford University press, 1942.
- Walsh, Richard. "Who is the Narrator?" *Poetics Today* 18.4 (1997): 495-514 <<http://www.proquest.com>>.

