



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

“Claire Kilroy’s *All Summer* and *The Devil I Know*:
a Narratological Study”

verfasst von / submitted by

Mag. phil. Saša Perović

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2020 / Vienna 2020

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt:

Betreuer

A 066 844

Anglophone Literatures and Cultures

Ao. Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Franz WÖHRER

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.2 Methodology and Structure	2
2. Theory	4
2.1 Unreliability	4
2.2 Narrative Situation	7
2.3. Time in Narrative	9
2.3.1 Sequence	9
2.3.2 Duration	10
2.3.3 Summary	10
2.3.4 Scene	11
2.3.5 Slow-down	11
2.3.6 Ellipsis	11
2.3.7 Pause	12
2.3.8 Frequency	12
2.4 Focalization	13
2.5 Metafiction and Metanarration	15
2.5.1 The Disnarrated / Denarrated	18
2.6 Speech Representation	19
3. Narratological Analysis of <i>All Summer</i>	22
3.1 Unreliability	22
3.2 Narrative Situation	26
3.3 Narrative Time	28
3.3.1 Sequence	28
3.3.2 Summary	29
3.3.3 Descriptions of Scenes	31
3.3.4 Slow-down	32
3.3.5 Ellipsis	33
3.3.6 Narrative Pause	34

3.4 Focalization.....	35
3.5 Metafiction and Metanarration.....	40
3.5.1 The Disnarrated / Denarrated.....	46
3.6 Speech Representation.....	49
4. Narratological Analysis of <i>The Devil I Know</i>.....	55
4.1 Unreliability.....	55
4.2 Narrative Situation.....	58
4.3 Narrative Time.....	61
4.3.1 Sequence.....	61
4.3.2 Summary.....	63
4.3.3 Descriptions of Scenes.....	64
4.3.4 Pause.....	66
4.3.5 Frequency.....	66
4.4 Focalization.....	68
4.5 Metafiction and Metanarration.....	73
4.5.1 Types of Metanarration.....	74
4.5.2 Virtual Embedded Narratives.....	75
4.5.3 Metanarrative Signs.....	77
4.5.4 Metaleptic Commentaries.....	79
4.5.5 Disnarrated Events.....	80
4.5.6 Denarrated Events.....	81
4.6 Speech Representation.....	83
4.6.1 Consonant and Dissonant Self-narration.....	84
4.6.2 Self-narrated and Self-quoted Monologues.....	88
5. Conclusion.....	89
6. Bibliography.....	92
7. Appendix: Plot Summaries.....	97
8. English Abstract.....	100
9. Deutsche Zusammenfassung.....	100

1. Introduction

Claire Kilroy is a contemporary Irish novelist, whose literary success consists of four works of fiction: *All Summer* (2003), *Tenderwire* (2006), *All Names Have Been Changed* (2009), and *The Devil I Know* (2012). Her debut novel was published in 2003, for which she received the Rooney Prize for Irish Literature, whereas her latest novel (2012) was internationally and critically acclaimed. Both these works of fiction are analyzed in this thesis as they are representative of the writer's creative accomplishments. Despite being different in topics and content, these two novels share similar narrative strategies and literary devices, which will be examined in detail in this study.

The aim of this study is to provide a brief summary of the up-to-date literature pertaining to narratology or theory of narrative and to apply the narratological analysis of the two novels by the Irish novelist, Claire Kilroy. The idea of what narratology represents to scholars and students has been formed most precisely by the classic studies of Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, Seymour Chatman and Gerald Prince (Alber and Fludernik 2). Patrick O'Neill claims that most recent theory on narratology is based on the essential discrimination "between two 'levels' of *story* and *discourse*, between 'what really happened' (the contents of narrative) and 'how what really happened is told' (the expression of the narrative)" (20). This claim is supported by Herman and Vervaeck, who state that the fundamental contribution of traditional narratology represents "the difference between elements within the narrative world and those outside it" (6).

Fundamentally speaking, narratology is "*a system of scientific practices* for research into the *conditions of possibility* of an object domain called 'narrative'" (Meister 57). In other words, it is "the study of narrative as a genre" whose "objective is to describe the consonants, variables and combinations typical of narrative and to clarify how these characteristics of narrative texts connect within the framework of theoretical models (typologies)" (Fludernik, *An Introduction* 8). However, any narratological approach does have its limitations:

Narratology has done an impressive job in identifying textual structures, but in its effort to achieve objectivity, it has neglected the cognitive functions of these structures. Unfortunately, if we want to say anything interesting about literature, we have to go beyond the objective facts. (Farner 191)

Due to its disadvantages, similar attitudes to classical narratology seem to demote it to a “toolkit” and point to its difficult cross-reference (Chihai 29). The presence of interchangeable terminology has been acknowledged by many scholars as there is a “fuzzy boundary line between a general literary study of narratives and more specifically narratological analysis of the same texts” (Alber and Fludernik 5). Furthermore, “despite a burst of energetic and highly intelligent research over the last thirty years and genuine progress that has been made, there is not yet a consensus on any of the key issues in the study of narrative” (Abbot, Preface XII). The elemental terms and concepts employed in this study stem from a number of seminal surveys of narratology, especially those recommended to budding narratologists by Monika Fludernik in her *Introduction to Narratology* (136) – Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan’s *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (2002), Mieke Bal’s *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (1997), Steven Cohan and Linda Shires’s *Telling Stories: A Theoretical Analysis of Narrative Fiction* (1988), Paul Cobley’s *Narrative: The New Critical Idiom* (2001), Horace Porter Abbott’s *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative* (2002), and Suzanne Keen’s *Narrative Form* (2003). Among these and other introductions of the last decade, there are those “that add more and more “applied” training to classical narratology, and those that transcend literary contexts altogether and get straight to the point of postclassical narratology” (Chihai 24). Hogan argues that “many fundamentals of narratology were set out in the founding works of classical narratology” (15). Moreover, the shift from classical to postclassical narratology is regarded as a move from structuralist to interdisciplinary realms of narrative analysis (Herman 2009, Johnstone 2001).

1.2 Methodology and Structure

The body of this thesis consists of two aspects – theoretical and analytical, whereas the analytical text is divided into two parts – the application of literary devices to *All Summer* and the investigation into *The Devil I Know*, respectively. In the analytical part, the examination of both novels is structured according to the same pattern that corresponds to the key aspects of narrative theory and is divided into chapters.

As the title of the thesis suggests, the scholarly approach to the two novels is essentially narratological, and thus, the tools borrowed, and terms employed stem from the theory of narrative. Due to the limited scope of a master thesis, it is impossible to apply the entire body of knowledge

to the two literary texts. Therefore, a selection of theoretical principles and terminology has been made to accommodate the analytical process. This study considers the basis of narratological theory, which includes six pillars of the theory – reliability, narrative situation, time in narrative, focalization, metafiction, and speech representation.

Chapter one examines the narrator and the questions of the alleged truthfulness of his/her storytelling. Close investigation of the novels exposes the motives that guide the narrator's account and the circumstances that affect the narrator's deposition, as well as the effect an unreliable narrator imposes on the reader's experience. The strategies employed by the narrator give evidence of the degree of incongruity between what is recounted and the reality of the story world. On the basis of these narratological considerations, this chapter also provides the classification of the specific type of narrator (extradiegetic vs. intradiegetic).

The examination of the overall structures of the two novels, the relationship between narrators, characters, and the narratees are part of the chapter on narrative situation. The second chapter sheds light on the author's designation of the internal order of narrative levels, the hierarchical juxtaposition of frame and embedded narratives, and the functions that certain hyponarratives have. This section demonstrates the narratorial type in more detail, such as the position of the narrator on the level of action and the narrator's level of intrusion and overttness.

The third chapter investigates the narrative time in its three prominent aspects – sequence, duration, and frequency. Regarding the sequential ordering, this thesis deals with the narration of certain key events the exposition of which is delayed by the narrators and examines the motivation behind these postponements. Furthermore, some actions and events are described by means of a lengthy scenic presentation, others in just a few sentences, while there are also many incidents that are completely omitted from the narrative. There is also an attempt at illuminating the difference between the narration and the occurrence of events in the novels. Lastly, this study tries to illustrate the function of the narrative strategies employed.

Approaches to the perspective in the novels or the issue of focalization is dealt with in the fourth chapter of this study. This section delves into the triad of key elements (the vision, the focalizer, and the focalized object), and briefly touches upon the much-debated definition of the term. The major concern is the vehicle of focalization (the choice between the narrator or the character), and the scope of perspective-taking (internal or external focalization). Moreover, this chapter includes

the Göran Nieragden proposition of a new delineation, based on the type of the narrative it occurs in (heterodiegetic or homodiegetic) and the type of the focalizer (the narrator or the character).

Due to the presence of highly self-reflexive and self-assertive narrators in both literary works by Claire Kilroy, the fifth chapter is devoted to analyzing the instances of metafiction and metanarration. The findings are related to the frequent switching to the narrative discourse conducted by the self-conscious narrator and the transgressions between the narrative levels employed by the characters as well. As the variety of self-referential comments abound both novels, this study refers to Macrae's classification of the five types of metanarration (the metatextual, the metacompositional, the metadiegetic, the metanarrative, and the metadiscursive). Furthermore, a part of this chapter is reserved for the analysis into the virtual embedded narratives, the disnarrated, and denarrated events (Marie-Laure Ryan, Prince, Richardson) since both narrator-protagonists engage in the periodical narration of the events that do not occur in the story world.

The final chapter is based on Dorrit Cohn's narratological study *Transparent Minds*, and analyzes primarily the thoughts and speech of the narrators and characters. The mediacy of mental actions through language is the main topic of examination in this section. The presence of narrator-protagonists who look back at past experiences and deliver a story that alternatively takes the form of monologues, psycho-narration, or consonant and dissonant self-narrative remarks, results in an in-depth approach to these modes of presenting consciousness in fiction.

2. Theory

2.1 Unreliability

Unreliable narration has recently become a center of heated discussions among narrative theorists. Yacobi introduces an „unreliability hypothesis“ that refers to the mechanism of perspective as a way of detecting textual incongruities:

It [unreliability hypothesis] brings discordant elements into pattern by attributing them to the peculiarities of the speaker or observer through whom the world is mediated. This mediator's deficiencies [...] are manipulated for a variety of ends: rhetorical (notably irony of some kind), psychological, thematic, etc. And by a reverse hypothesis of congruity, we deduce reliable narration. (Yacobi 224)

The point Yacobi makes here concerns the fact that reliable narration is usually negatively connoted, and the practice is always reverted – signs of unreliability need to be absent in order to infer that the narrator's authority is sustained.

Rimmon-Kenan asserts that an unreliable narrator functions as the “one whose rendering of the story and/or commentary on it the reader has reasons to suspect” (103). Regardless whether there is an unreliable “omniscient” narrator or a character-narrator, “[t]here must be some possibility of discriminating between truth and falsehood within the imagined world of the novel, as there is in the real world” (Lodge 155). Such discriminations and inferences are often difficult to draw. Any conflicting testimonies, corroborations or purely textual indices of manipulation may alert the reader to cast doubts on the narrating agent's judgments and beliefs. In other words, detecting a lack of the narrator's credulity is mostly done by the reader, and, therefore, unreliability is defined in terms of readership. Olson posits that readers are to weigh the total textual information and decide if the teller's statements are incongruous or incomplete (95). Furthermore, the evaluation of truthfulness is rather problematic when the events from a distant past are narrated because “there will be difficulties in establishing whether the events depicted actually took place or whether they are embellished, embroidered or plain fiction” (Cobley 29).

A narrator may be deemed unreliable because of different impressions and inferences. Fludernik lists narrators who are dishonest, naïve or have mad ideas and false convictions to be likely to lose credibility with an authorial audience (*An Introduction* 27). When it comes to fallible observers, Rimmon-Kenan shares his view on the problematic value-scheme with Fludernik. However, the former introduces the notion of the narrator's limited knowledge (103), the opposite of which Booth calls privilege and the corresponding privileged narrator-agents. Relating to both third- and first-person narration, Booth defines omniscience as “complete privilege”, while “the most important single privilege is that of obtaining an inside view, because of the rhetorical power that such a privilege conveys upon a narrator” (*The Rhetoric* 94). In that sense, access to a character's mind and intradiegetic narration or reporting from within may provide most interesting findings.

Many narratologists rely on the relationship between the unreliable narrator and the implied author to define unreliable or fallible narration. For instance, Fludernik explains how helpful its role can be in perceiving the fallible teller:

[A] reader only realizes that a first-person narrator is unreliable because s/he assumes that the implied author holds views in direct conflict with those held by the first-person narrator. Unreliable narrative discourse creates the impression that the implied author is communicating with the reader behind the first-person narrator's back. The narrator is deliberately presented as a figure whom the reader discovers to be lacking in credibility. An unreliable first-person narrator functions, therefore, as a sign of the fictionality of the text. (Fludernik, *An Introduction* 27)

Booth complements the statements by saying that the reader and the implied author form an exclusive partnership that is based on similar interpretations, judgments and opinions (qtd. in Olson 94). His position on the actual difference between different types of unreliable narrators is based on their deviance from the norm of the author (Booth, *Distance* 93). In that respect, based on the discrepancy between the author and the narrating agent in the story, Dorrit Cohn makes a distinction between two types of unreliable narrators – the “mis- or disinformed narrator, unwilling or unable to tell what actually happened” and the “narrator who is biased or confused” (*Discordant Narration* 307). However, the narrator frequently fails to comprehend that the audience may appear to be struggling to understand his or her dispositions and considerations (Brütsch 222). Nonetheless, this does not add to the credulity of their accounts. Regardless of their degree of fallibility, narrating agents can be defined according to their relationship to other narrators. These narrators can either support or correct the main narrator-agent, unless he or she is the sole source of narration in and outside the story world. According to Booth, the first type is known as supported or corrected narrator, and the latter isolated (*Distance* 94).

The narrators tend to be regarded as inescapably fallible despite being relatively overt or covert, intradiegetic or extradiegetic:

When an extradiegetic narrator becomes more overt, his chances of being fully reliable are diminished, since his interpretations, judgments, generalizations are not always compatible with the norms of the implied author. Intradiegetic narrators, especially when they are also homodiegetic, are on the whole more fallible than extradiegetic ones, because they are also characters in the fictional world. (Rimmon-Kenan 106)

Narrators are open to the readers' scrutiny and potentially destined to elicit doubt and disbelief in readers regardless of being a part of the story world or not.

Based on Nünning's study¹, Olson provides a list of textual markers and indices of unreliability in a literary work. The list comprises, among others, corrective body signals, multiperspectival arrangements of events, a considerable number of reader addresses and attempts to gain readers' sympathy. Furthermore, there are various self-references, such as an admitted lack of credulity, occasional memory gaps, ellipses, repetitions and commentaries on cognitive restrictions. High level of subjectivity and emotional involvement about the content of the narrator's sentences belong to the list as well (Olson 98).

2.2 Narrative Situation

To quote Suzanne Keen, “virtually the first thing narrative theorists seek to ascertain about a text is its narrative situation” (31). According to her, “narrative situation encompasses narrative levels, the narrator, and the relationship of the narrator to the characters” (44). This chapter begins with and investigates these two concepts in detail as they prove important to the poetics of the analyzed novels.

Keen illuminates the complexity of the term narrative level by stating that two levels, “[the] discourse level, a realm of narrated words-in-order, and the story level, a realm of imagined actions and agents” constitute the very conception (30). Basically, a narrative level is comprised by the two plains, the discursive dimension and the storyline. However, their relationship is the one of subordination – “[n]arration is always at a higher level than the story it narrates” (Rimmon-Kenan 94). The verticality of the two levels stems from the intrinsic properties that influence their mutual relation. While both Rimmon-Kenan and Farner share the same view on the temporal relationship i.e. almost all narration is ulterior, or happening after the events took place (Rimmon-Kenan 92, Farner 201), Farner adds the causal dimension in which “the narrative process creates the mental model of the action” (201).

¹ Nünning, Ansgar. “Unreliable Narration zur Einführung: Grundzüge einer Kognitiv-Narratologischen Theorie und Analyse Unglaubwürdigen Erzählens.” *Unreliable Narration: Studien zur Theorie und Praxis Unglaubwürdigen Erzählens in der Englischsprachigen Erzählliteratur*. Ed. Ansgar Nünning. Trier: WVT. 1998. 3-40.

Looking at the stratification of narrative levels in the previous paragraph, a classification of narratives and their corresponding narrators can be established in literary fiction. Genette introduces the extradiegetic and diegetic or intradiegetic levels (*Narrative Discourse* 228). The difference in levels also corresponds to the terms of first-degree and second-degree narratives. The levels that are ‘beneath’ (second-degree, third-degree, and so on) tend to have complex relationships with the levels that embed them, which calls for a proper functional division, proposed by Rimmon-Kenan. There are three functions which define the hypodiegetic narratives – actional, explicative, and thematic (95). For this study, the last two seem most relevant. Namely, explicative function of the hypodiegetic level, as the name suggests, serves as an explanation for the events in the first narrative or “they [embedded narratives] recount how the present of the main narrative has come to be” (De Jong 24), while thematic function binds the two narratives in an analogical relationship of similarity or contrast (95). Furthermore, Coste and Pier, quoting Genette, provide a refined categorization of these functions, expanding it to persuasive and obstructive (296).

As it has been mentioned, narrators can be placed outside the story level (extradiegetic), or within the story world where they narrate the events (intradiegetic), in relation to narrative levels (Rimmon-Kenan 97). There is also the third category called homodiegetic narrators, of which:

[t]he only difference between intra- and homodiegetic is that the former applies to the second-degree and third-degree narrator’s presence on the level of the narrative act, while the latter refers to the first-degree narrator’s presence on the level of his own narrative act – which is self-evident – as well as to his presence on the level of action. (Farner 208)

Furthermore, there is also autodiegetic narration. This mode of narrating “constitutes a special case of first-person or homodiegetic narration in which the narrator does not only participate in the action being recounted but is also the main character in the storyworld evoked by the text” (Herman, *Basic Elements* 66). Another criterion for determining the type of narrators is based on their attitude and the choice of grammatical persons made by the authors themselves, hence the selection between first-person, second-person and third-person narrators. Farner’s explanation of the first-person narrator defines the narrators of novels in general “[b]ecause the first-person narrator is identical with one of the fictional characters, we encounter two stages in the narrator’s life: his past as a participant in the action and his present life as the narrator writing down his reminiscences” (Farner 211). Comparing the first-person narrative to the third-person narrative, the

relationship of the narrator to the level of the action makes a difference as “the narrator of a third-person narrative is not identical with any of the characters involved in the action” (Farner 211).

2.3 Time in Narrative

It is the view of Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan on time in narrative and its corresponding classification that prove very important for this study. His theory on narrative time is based upon Genette and his work. Moreover, the terms he uses are based on Genette's terms, such as analepsis and prolepsis.

Time in general may be viewed in three aspects: order, duration and frequency. Statements about order would answer the question 'when?' in terms like: first, second, last; before, after, etc. Statements about duration would answer the question 'how long?' in terms like: an hour, a year; long, short; from x till y, etc. Statements about frequency would answer the question 'how often?' in terms like: x times a minute, a month, a page. (Rimmon-Kenan 61)

2.3.1 Sequence

According to Fludernik, “the sequence of events which feature in the story has to be compared with the order in which these events are depicted at the level of representation, in the narrative discourse” (*An Introduction* 32). She relates the two terms and points to the importance of their connection.

Gerald Prince adds that narrative sequences represent linked series of situations and events. They can be expanded, summarized or combined with other sequences. These types of combinations include conjunction, embedding, alternation or even extraction from larger sentences (12).

One advantage of the play with sequential ordering is that it offers a means of portraying various interpretations of a single event. Mieke Bal explains the possibility of a double linearity in a narrative text, the first being the series of sentences and the latter a series of events. Such linearity can be broken, and the deviations often exert the reader's meticulous attention (80-81).

2.3.2 Duration

It has been suggested that duration in a narrative represents the length of story time and discourse time. Cohan and Shires stress the predominance of duration over sequence and order, because it distinctly foregrounds the mediating process done by a narrator or any narrating agency (89). They consider *summary* and *scene* as the two most common methods of narrating duration. Bal claims that “[key events] are presented extensively in scenes, while insignificant events – insignificant in the sense that they do not greatly influence the course of the fabula – are quickly summarized” (102). However, Rimmon-Kennan shows that “sometimes the total effect of shock or irony is relayed to us by summing up briefly the most central event and rendering trivial events in detail” (71). In conjunction with these two recurring techniques, other similar narrating elements include *slow-down*, *pause*, and *ellipsis*.

2.3.3 Summary

Cohan and Shires focus on the alternation between *summary* and *scene* in most prose narration (88), while Bal is of the opinion that this equal allocation in narratives tends to be rejected (103).

Rimmon-Kenan state that *summary* is one element in the infinity of possible paces of narration, and *scene* is the other. In a summary, the pace is accelerated, and the part of the story compressed into a comparatively short statement (55). In other words, discourse time or text time is accelerated at the expanse of story time. Important for this study is Chatman's view on summary as it “presupposes a desire to account for time-passage, to satisfy questions in a narratee's mind about what has happened in the interval. An account cannot but draw attention to the one who felt obliged to make such an account” (qtd. in Rimmon-Kenan 100). Chatman believes that the narrated events in summary indirectly point to the narrating agent whose presence is almost imposingly felt, while Lodge claims that such abbreviated actions may be distracting because of their either uninteresting or too interesting nature. Nevertheless, the readers are hurried through events to avoid the risk of being unnecessarily distracted from the actions in the story world, which are of interest to the author (122).

2.3.4 Scene

Scene is generally considered as a static description, or an exchange of dialogue. The latter corresponds to the purest scenic form as dialogue bears resemblance to a segment in a play and rather than in a narrative. According to Bal, a scene is, regardless of its textual form, a part of text in which text time equals story time (100). Scene is rich in narrative information, whereas the relative effacement of the narrator is another feature (Rimmon-Kenan 56). Cohan and Shires indicate the relative presence and mediation of the narrating agency in a scene. It is due to the narrator's implicitness that story time and text time seem equivalent (89).

2.3.5 Slow-down

The third type of relationship between discourse time and story time named *slow-down*, in which narrational duration is extended. It is contrasted with *summary* and occurs very seldom in literature. Almost entirely cinematically, “our attention is directed towards the fact that the passage of time has slowed down” (Bal 106). Cohan and Shires explain that the use of *slow-down* “inverts the relation of story and narrational times set up in a summary by recounting events in slow-motion, as it were”. Interestingly, they speak of its indirect application “when two simultaneous events are narrated in succession or alternation” (88-89). It is exactly this juxtaposition and transition of synchronous events in narrative that is relevant for this study.

2.3.6 Ellipsis

Ellipsis or omission in narration refers to a narrational gap. Alongside *slow-down* and *pause*, *ellipsis* underscores narration over story, and directs attention to the failure of the narration to incorporate an event from the story (Cohan and Shires 89). Or, as Fludernik claims “something [that] occurs in the fictional world is not mentioned at all on the level of narrative discourse”. She also shows that the primary function of *ellipsis* is a filter of the information that would otherwise overburden the narrative with details (*An Introduction* 33). On the other hand, Bal underlines that the contents of the narrative ellipsis can either be too painful or too eloquently difficult to be narrated (101).

2.3.7 Pause

Rimmon-Kenan states that a descriptive pause manifests itself where some segment of the text does not correspond to the duration of a story (55). Fludernik envisages narrative pauses as “descriptions of landscape, of states of mind, or of socio-historical background [that] do not correlate at all with any action in the world of the story” (*An Introduction* 33). Furthermore, elements of pause coincide with reader addresses according to Cohan and Shires. They also state that a pause most explicitly directs attention to narratorial mediation and the narrating agency (89). David Herman goes further to explain that “a narrative pause [is] used for expositional purposes, [and that] the perspective-taking activity registered in the text [...] comes to a halt” (*Storytelling* 186). This double functionality of a pause (pointing to a narrating agency and taking a different perspective) is of utmost importance for the study, as it will be shown.

2.3.8 Frequency

Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan praises Genette as the first to treat *frequency* as a temporal component in narration (59). By narrative frequency Genette understands “relative frequency of the narrated events and of the narrative sections that report them” (*Time and Narrative* 127) i.e. the numerical relation between events and their frequent or infrequent narration. Their relationship revolves around repetition. When an event is repeated, it is either changed or its meaning is accentuated. Thus, it is both “identical and different” and “the past receives a different significance” (Bal 90-91).

One form of repetition relation of a story event and its narration is called singulative. It is “the most obvious form of narration [and] will tell once what happens once” (Genette, *Time and Narrative* 127). Such “singular presentation of a singular event” (Bal 110) is contrasted with the repetitive form, and the corresponding event is “the repeated event” (Cohan and Shires 86). According to Genette, a narrative “can also tell several times, with or without variations, an event that happened only once” (*Time and Narrative* 128). In other words, it presupposes that one and the same event is recounted multiple times in a narrative. There is also a third type of frequency, known as iterative narration. Here various events are presented once. Fludernik

stresses its economic value, stating that iterative narrative consists of “more than one similar event [that] is told once only for the sake of abbreviation” (*An Introduction* 35).

2.4 Focalization

Pertaining to the narrator, H. Porter Abbot sees focalization as one of its three most valuable discriminations (the other two being voice and distance) (64). This salient discrimination has been discussed by many theorists of narrative fiction, among which Mieke Bal and Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan offer most comprehensive studies. Before exploring the role, which focalization plays in literary texts, a comparison with other terminologies needs to be considered. Utell points that “if mood, voice, and attitude are what we use to talk about who is speaking in a narrative, perspective and focalization are what we use to talk about who is seeing, and what they are seeing, and from which point of view they are seeing” (32). Many scholars distinguish between the term focalization and point of view or viewpoint. Farner stresses that the former coinage not only draws attention to what is perceived, but also to the reader’s scope and quality of input. On the other hand, the latter term highlights the perceiver (Farner 232). Bal favors the term focalization label since it is the only one that differentiates between “on the one hand, the vision through which the elements are presented and, on the other, the identity of the voice that is verbalizing that vision” (146). Palmer praises the concept for its applicability regarding perception, however he criticizes its framework when dealing with mental life or feelings, stating that it “can become rather cumbersome, uninformative, and even misleading” (Palmer, *Fictional Minds* 49). Nevertheless, perhaps one of the most significant benefits focalization has for narration would be “the textual inscription of a position for the reader in relation to the story, a position which exceeds a narrator’s “point of view” since it is produced by language” (Cohan and Shires 97).

It is widely held among scholars that focalization has its subject and object, or ‘who sees?’ and ‘what is seen’. Bal defines the subject of focalization as the focalizer, or “the point from which the elements are viewed” (149). Interestingly, the focalizer does not necessarily coincide with the character or the narrator, as narratologists precisely distinguish between “who sees?” and ‘who speaks?’, i. e. between focalization and narration. Similarly, the focalized would be “what is being seen and, thus narrated” (Cohan and Shires 95). Considering their quality of omniscience, the narrator can be situated almost anywhere in the text. When focalization is delegated to the narrator,

they can penetrate the character's mind and report on their thoughts and emotions, which is known as internal focalization (Farner 235). However, when the narrator operates as the focalizer ('narrator-focalizer'), and "the descriptions are limited to characters' external behavior", such focalization is known as external (Palmer, *Fictional Minds* 48). Bal abbreviates such an external, non-character-bound focalizer as EF, and alternately character-bound focalization as CF (151-152). However, even the focalized follows a similar typology according to Rimmon-Kenan. She explains that "the focalized can be seen either from without or from within" (78). Drawing upon Genette, Farner investigates the case when the narrator allocates both types of focalization among characters. If a single event is narrated by at least two characters in the story, the focalization is multiple or many-sided, which offers more options for interpretation of the action, thus making the input more balanced (Farner 238-239). Such a move from one focalizer to another, as well as the very existence of the focalizer may be indicated by language (Rimmon-Kenan 85). She adds that the naming of characters is just one example of such indication, the shifts of which hint at a change of focalizer (85). Niederhoff explains that the readers may learn about what the characters think or feel (even subconsciously), based on the omniscience model of narration. The perception further extends to each imaginable part in the storyworld (385). Cordesse and Fludernik agree that the so-called zero focalization (or omniscience) is not applicable for first-person narratives as its narrator "does not have access to other minds and is restricted to what he has learnt in the course of the story" (qtd. in Niederhoff 390).

Rimmon-Kenan explains that external focalization is not only an aspect of third-person novels with omniscient narrators, but is also present in first-person narratives, especially "when the perception through which the story is rendered is that of the narrating self rather than that of the experiencing self" (76). She remarks that the same type of focalization is called retrospective when the character focalizes their own past. However, drawing upon Uspensky, Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan argues that "an internal focalizer is limited to the 'present' of the characters" (80). In case when the focalizer is not the narrator, an opportunity to withhold information emerges (80-1). Here it would be fruitful for the analysis to mention Bal's view on memory as a very important case for differentiating between the focalizer and the narrator. Seeing memory as a narrative act that needs to be remembered in order to be told, Bal explains that such an unreliable narrative ultimately has less effect on the audience and is "rhetorically overworked". Moreover, "[t]raumatic events disrupt the capacity to comprehend and experience them at the time of their occurrence" (Bal 150).

Consequently, she concludes that the remembered and the experienced story differ. Her further investigations refer to the levels of focalization, and she states that different layers are perceptible in the narrative (Bal 161). Moreover, on the first level of focalization, there is the external focalizer who further lends focalization to the internal focalizer who is present on the second level, and such transfer of focalization between levels is implicitly or explicitly marked by the so called 'attributive signs' (162).

A recent study by Göran Nieragden suggests a refinement in typology regarding the relationship between focalization and narration. Namely, he combines the hierarchy of focalization and the narrative situation model to present the rearrangement in terminology. As external focalization is invariably heterodiegetic, he proposes that this type be named heterodiegetic narratorial focalization (Nieragden 691). However, this is valid only if the focalizer is the narrator, whereas "if the focalizer in a heterodiegetic narrative is not the narrator, but a character, this should be called *heterodiegetic figural focalization*" (691). Conversely, since internal focalization may exist in both heterodiegetic and homodiegetic narratives, homodiegetic figural focalization occurs when focalization is allocated to a character, and when the narrator is the vehicle of focalization, then he recommends the focalization to be called homodiegetic narratorial focalization (691).

2.5 Metafiction and Metanarration

It is vital to establish the difference between these two literary devices which are generally considered to be the same. The most recent study by Neuman and Nünning views the mechanisms differently:

Metafiction and Metanarration are umbrella terms designating self-reflexive utterances, i.e. comments referring to the discourse rather than to the story. Although they are related and often used interchangeably, the terms should be distinguished: metanarration refers to the narrator's reflections on the act or process of narration; metafiction concerns comments on the fictionality and/or constructedness of the narrative. (Neumann and Nünning 204)

As stated in this definition, both types of utterances usually originate from the narrator who points to the act of telling the story, the way it is written and created rather than the realism of a narrative.

These devices disrupt the flow of the story and direct the attention briefly to the teller figure and their mode of showing or telling.

The term metafiction was first coined by William Gass in the early 1970s (Scholes 21). According to Patricia Waugh, the concept “is given to fictional writing which self-consciously and systematically draws attention to its status as an artefact in order to pose questions about the relationship between fiction and reality” (2). Based on Nünning’s study, Monika Fludernik argues that the term metafiction is functional to “refer to all sorts of techniques that explicitly or implicitly ‘break’ what is called the mimetic illusion generated by fictional narrative” (*Metanarrative* 11), whereas Macrae states that it is “dominantly self-reflexive” (5). She broadens our understanding of metanarration, and labels it as a “metafictional technique” which “serves to foreground the mediating role of the teller, and of the reader as interpreter, to destabilise the reliability of any one version or interpretation of events” (19). Alongside metanarration, the other two metafictional techniques include metalepsis and disnarration (64).

Narrative metalepsis (or *frame-breaking* by McHale) can be regarded as “a breaking of the boundaries that separate distinct ‘levels’ of a narrative, usually between an embedded tale and its frame story”², whereas Macrae speaks of the most common type of metalepsis of which “a third-person narrator [is] suddenly appearing within the fictional world of which he/she tells” (102). Gerard Genette explains how such intrusion “produces an effect of strangeness that is either comical [...] or fantastic” (235). This “logic-defying” metalepsis (Suzanne Keen) transgresses the divide in three distinct manners according to Andrea Macrae – metaleptic awareness, metaleptic communication, and metaleptic moves. The first two concepts define breaches in narrative levels caused by either the character’s realization that they are a controlled entity in the narrator’s descriptions, or by the conversation between narrators or characters across narrative levels. The third type is delineated by the transposition of characters or narrators between levels (Macrae 108). Genette makes a clear distinction in the type of metaleptic moves and distinguishes between the narrators who descend to the hyponarrative and the characters of the embedded narrative that act as narratees (qtd. in Fludernik, *Scene Shift* 385). Hanebeck and Thoss clearly state that a metaleptic transgression infallibly bears elements of at least another type (qtd. in Macrae 109). Another form of transgression of boundaries, called metanarrative signs, represent links or references to certain

² Baldick, Chris. “Metalepsis.” *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2015

parts of the storyworld and units in the story. These indications consist of commenting elements which tend to elucidate the function and meaning of units in the story (Prince, *Metanarrative Signs* 58-60). Furthermore, these signs refer to proairetic or cultural codes in narratives and contribute to characterization (93-94).

Andrea Macrae proposes a typology based on the terms by Nünning and Fludernik while modeling Genette's, Fludernik's, and Wolf's categories of metanarration. The types are narrowly interrelated, and metanarrative instances may refer to various categories. The entire delineation is established on "the dominant focus or object of the metanarrative comment" (Macrae 73). The five categories include the metatextual, the metacompositional, the metadiegetic, the metanarrative, and the metadiscursive.

Macrae defines metanarration as textual when it "focuses predominantly on the textual medium of the narrative. It involves references to the sequential, material, physical text, and to the textual nature of the communication (the writtenness of the narration)" (73). As examples of such a medium, she lists "references to print, ink, typing, pages, the book form, etc" (73). This type of metanarration proves valuable for the research when observed in relation to the progress of the plot or characterization (Macrae 73). The second category of metanarration deals with "the act of composition of that narrative, [...] the imaginative invention of the story, and the creative writing process" (Macrae 76), and as such is designated as metacompositional metanarration. The concept reveals the making or forming, and the discourse composition, however it serves a function of investigating the complex relationship between the narrator's role and its creations, foregrounding the idea of narrator as the creative agency (76). The third type of metanarration is called metadiegetic, and it investigates the construction and representation of the storyworld and its ontological status, plot, and characters (Macrae 81-82). She adds that metadiegetic metanarration "might refer to the setting *as* a setting, characters *as* characters, the storyworld's parameters, the plot structure, and so on" (82). Macrae's definition of metanarrative metanarration differs from Fludernik's concept of the "metanarratorial type" since the roles of discourse members are not analyzed. Nevertheless, Macrae's category explores "the structure or organization of the narrative, narrative techniques and conventions, and the narrator's act of telling" (86). The last concept on the list is named metadiscursive metanarration, and it undermines the relationships between the participants in the discourse and the narrative. The examples Andrea Macrae analyzes highlight "the narrator, usually designated with the deictic first-person pronoun 'I', together with the reader,

usually designated as ‘you’” (91), however this category also profoundly explores the role of the narrator as the textual self-asserting agent who tends to break the illusion of mimesis (92).

2.5.1 The Disnarrated / Denarrated

In his seminal essay of 1988 on the disnarrated, Gerald Prince explains the difference between the unnarratable, the unnarrated and their opposite, the disnarrated (Prince, *The Disnarrated* 2). He proposes this third concept, which is unlike the first two, as it is the only one that includes events that never occur but, nonetheless, are mentioned in the narrative. Grishakova considers the disnarrated broadly and concludes that this category corresponds to the counterfactuals or “what could or might have happened but didn’t” (92). Similarly, Marie-Laure Ryan focuses on “virtual embedded narratives”. These hyponarratives refer to “mental constructs [that] include such private domains as wishes, intents, and obligations” (qtd. in Prince, *The Disnarrated* 2). Following Prince’s conceptualization of the disnarrated, Brian Richardson designates the denarrated as narrative negatives “in which a narrator denies significant aspects of her narrative that had earlier been presented as given” (168), the effect of which “is nearly always arresting, and to many readers it can be quite disconcerting” (168). Richardson juxtaposes this term with reliability and reader response to conclude that “[a denarrated section] invites more possible interpretative positions concerning the subjectivity of the narrator, as the reader wonders whether the narrator is incompetent, disoriented, devious, or insane” (173). Based on the analyses of the literary works of Beckett, Drabble, and Rushdie, he introduces the term “duplicitous” narrator who “deliberately provides information that is later falsified by subsequent statements in the narration” (Richardson 173). From the narratological stance, Dannenberg views Prince’s encapsulating description of the many designate shapes of the disnarrated as including “the myriad private mental worlds of characters evoked by focalization, implication, or thought report” (306) as well as “metafictional flaunting of the author’s ultimate power to determine the events of a narrative” (307). Furthermore, since denarration undermines “the reader’s relationship to the story” and “the inscribed power dynamics between narrator and reader”, various metafictional implications arise as a result (Macrae 180). These events are given in the text but do not actually belong to the storyworld as they never happen. They exist in the relation to the extradiegetic narrator (Richardson) or the character (Dannenberg and Prince).

Narrative significance of the disnarrated is reflected in itself in the many functions it possesses. According to Gerald Prince, it may contribute to characterization “since it frequently consists of hopes, desires, imaginings and ponderings, unreasonable expectations and incorrect beliefs, since it depicts what is not or what might be and is often linked to carelessness, ignorance, or limitations resulting from insanity, delirium, an obsession, a psychological trauma” (*The Disnarrated* 4). He adds that it can represent a device for decreasing the speed of narration as these counterfactuals may pose as descriptions or commentaries (4). Andrea Macrae sees the disnarrated and denarrated events as foregrounding the narration’s prevalence compared to the storyworld, especially when regarding “the narrator’s overt assertions of authorial (and readerly) godlike control, the imperatives to the reader, and the reference to the dependence of the storyworld upon imaginative conceptualisation” (179).

2.6 Speech Representation

Suzanne Keen summarizes Dorrit Cohn’s classification in *Transparent Minds*, her seminal book on representing consciousness in fiction. As Keen states – there are three modes of representation: psycho-narration, narrated monologue, and quoted monologue (60). Psycho-narration (also known as thought report) is further divided into two considerably different variants: dissonant and consonant narrating of consciousness:

One is dominated by a prominent narrator who, even as he focuses intently on an individual psyche, remains emphatically distanced from the consciousness he narrates; the other is mediated by a narrator who remains effaced and who readily fuses with the consciousness he narrates. (Cohn, *Transparent Minds* 26)

Here the narrator’s attitude and distance become distinguishing factors for a clear distinction between sub-modes of psycho-narration. Alan Palmer posits that in dissonant thought report the narrator acts as a judging mediator and evaluates ethical norms of the observed character, while consonant psycho-narration resembles the idiom of the character and the narrator does not exploit their cognitive privilege. Therefore, the dissonance and consonance between the narrator and the character indicate closeness or distance among the two entities and thus define the approach the narrator takes on the character. Palmer adds that the former type of psycho-narration is more suited for intrusive and overt narrators, and the latter is commonly linked with figural narratives. He declares that, regardless of the mode, both types of psycho-narrations can share the same functions

such as presenting thoughts, events, or states of mind, including perceptions, visual images, emotions, memories, motives, intentions, mental actions and reasons behind these actions³. Cohan and Shires offer a method for not confusing dissonant and consonant psycho-narration. Their suggestion is based on the language used to mediate the character's mental processes and whether it stems from the teller or from the character concerned (Cohan and Shires 101).

This classification mainly refers to third-person narratives. However, since a first-person novel bears some resemblance to that of the third person regarding the modes of mind representation, certain rules overlap. As Dorrit Cohn states, there is, on the one hand, a similarity between rhetorical modes in the representation of psycho-narration in third-person novels and of the relationship between the narrating and the experiencing self in first-person narratives on the other hand (*Transparent Minds* 143-144). Nevertheless, such relationship in the first-person narratives “imitates the temporal continuity of real beings, an existential relationship that differs substantially from the purely functional relationship that binds a narrator to his protagonist in third-person fiction” (Cohn, *Transparent Minds* 144). This human touch of the narrating agent comes with some real human being's restraints, such as memory-depended accounts and restricted access to the teller's own past experiences, which, by default, prompts the uncertainty of the report (*Transparent Minds* 144).

Moreover, the narrator in first-person novels is constituted by the two selves that are in contrast to each other, especially in terms of knowledge – the narrating self has the freedom to choose which events to disclose first as he or she is aware of the entire past experience – “[t]he experiencing self in the first-person narration, by contrast, is always viewed by a narrator who knows what happened to him next, and who is free to slide up and down the time axis that connects his two selves” (Cohn, *Transparent Minds* 145).

The dissonance and consonance in narration are not primarily components of third-person novels, but of first-person narratives as well. Kirsi Hänninen summarizes Dorrit Cohn's take on the consonant and dissonant self-narration by highlighting their prominent attributes. For instance, in the dissonant mode, the narrating self is wise, contemplates the outcomes and causes of the actions, and provides explanations, judgments and analyses of the experiencing self. On the other hand, the

³ Palmer, Alan. *Thought and Consciousness Representation (Literature)*. London: Routledge, 2010. ProQuest, Web. 10 Mar. 2020. <<https://uaccess.univie.ac.at/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.uaccess.univie.ac.at/docview/2137943520?accountid=14682>>.

second type of the retrospective mental narration, the consonant self-narration, offers a psychological proximation of the narrating self and the experiencing self in the sense that the audience may not be able to discriminate between the two entities. This effect is achieved by the complete absence of any narrative tags pertaining to the comments or evaluations by the narrating self (Hänninen 4).

Since “[t]he dissonance or consonance of self-narration is, in short, a significant autobiographical fact” (Cohn, *Transparent Minds* 161), first-person novels that are replete with self-narration can be classified as autobiographical. In such novels, certain uncommon techniques of rendering consciousness occur, for example, self-narrated monologues, which are otherwise scarce in narratives. When trying to define these monologues, there is an analogy to be drawn between the relationships of the narrating self and the experiencing self in the first-person novels and the relation of the narrator to the characters in third-person figural narratives. Cohn explains that in these instances: “the narrator momentarily identifies with his past self, giving up his temporally distanced vantage point and cognitive privilege for his past time-bound bewilderments and vacillations” (*Transparent Minds* 167). She underlines the use of this rhetorically powerful device, which proves most effective when rendering the narrator’s empathy with their past selves. Excerpts with the self-narrated monologues are seemingly stripped of the narrating agent’s mediacy and their language, which allows for a close proximity of the experiencing self and the narrating self, and consequently first-person and third-person texts (Cohn, *Transparent Minds* 169).

Unlike in the self-narrated monologue, a self-quoted monologue is clearly marked by quoting phrases such as “I said to myself” or “I told myself” and visibly stands out from any surrounding narration (Cohn, *Transparent Minds* 161). In first-person texts, these verbatim statements occasionally express highly rhetorical speeches, however it is not clear, if the thoughts and attitudes correspond to the narrator’s present or past self. In that respect, the tellers may mislead the readers and cause confusion. The puzzlement reaches its peak when the ideas in the self-narrated monologue are distanced from the context they appear in (*Transparent Minds* 162).

3. Narratological Analysis of *All Summer*

3.1 Unreliability

The main protagonist exposes many signs of unreliability that can be detected across different plains of narration. Her “verbal habits” and statements about the narration itself give evidence to fallible narration. An admitted lack of credulity and comment on cognitive limitations from Olson’s list of particular instances of unreliable narration in the first chapter serve as such an example.

At one point in the novel, Anna admits to be unreliable and comments on her perception: “Strange, that – I never stood in the corner in the dark, yet that is how I saw the room when it drifted through my head late last night” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 97). She remembers something she is sure that could have never happened, which can be a sign of her own narratorial fallibility. Readers may find it hard to believe her future retelling and doubt what she had claimed to have occurred. Surprisingly enough, she does not correct herself, but supports the previous notion and invites the readers to reconsider her story “I will never quite get it, how the mind reworks everything slightly for no apparent reason, except, of course, to bring home to itself the fact that it can never be trusted” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 97). By reminding the readers of the reworking of the mind, she exposes herself as an untrustworthy teller.

Contradictory statements and incongruent propositions serve as an index of incomplete narration. The most stunning example of inconsistent narration in *All Summer* is the claim that one of the characters in the story may not even exist. Early in the novel, Anna assumes a position of an all-seeing author of her own story whose main character is a conservator. In this parallel story, she follows his actions and movements in the National Gallery, and introduces characters who meet, talk and assist him in the line of work. Readers find out that the Nordic assistant is a close colleague of the conservator. At one time, she serves as a focal point of narration and the narrator enters her mind to reveal her thoughts: “[t]he Nordic assistant hovers over the wastebasket, wondering what she should do. She decides to do nothing. I am no secretary, she tells herself, and turns on her heel. The policeman will just have to ring again” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 21-22). This instance of interior monologue offers clues to her characterization and

brings about a different perspective to the actions in the conservator's world. However, a couple of pages after this limited narration, Anna states the following: "she [the Nordic assistant] smiles; says good morning. She has perfect skin, and I am jealous of her. I don't know if the conservator has a Nordic assistant. If he does, I know that I am jealous. I know that I would never take to her" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 27). Anna Hunt discredits the presence of one of the characters in her story, which makes her whole narratorial exposition doubtful. She deliberately produces a character whose questionable existence may come as a shock to readers. I assume that Anna's object of jealousy is the projection of her desire and wish to be part of the conservator's world she objectively knows so little about. The creation came from her wishful desire to compensate for the lack of any means she can get close to him now that they are apart from each other. On the other hand, even though Anna acts as an extradiegetic narrator to this story, her story telling does not make her less fallible. Moreover, from this moment onward, readers are more alert to her dispositions, and would even question the existence of other characters in the conservator's professional environment, like the director of the National Gallery and the detective who investigates the case of the missing painting.

Another instance of unreliable narration concerns Anna's intradiegetic narratorial authority, or to be precise, her narration in moments of limited perception or awareness while being unconscious. The following excerpt from the novel guides the narration from an out-of-body point of view:

I grabbed his wrist and tried to push him away. He reacted with such force that he practically lifted me off the bed. It was probably the fright more than anything else that made me black out. The man's fists released my throat, and recoiled like snakes. There were footsteps around me. Cautious and stiff. The man was checking if I still breathed. He poked me in the ribs. He slapped me once or twice. I heard myself groan and I rolled onto my side. When I came round, I saw that all the stuff in my room had been rifled. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 48)

Narration between the two moments when Anna blacked out and came round is under great suspicion. It can hardly be overlooked that Anna, after losing consciousness, was able to grasp what was going around her at the time. She runs the risk of appearing fallible again because she deliberately breaks the limited view principle and goes against the unprivileged narration. However, if we consider that Anna assumed the role of a third-person narrator (extradiegetic narration) after losing consciousness, it can be argued that the narration is adequate to the narrator's current knowledge. Namely, the narrating-self looks back at the unfortunate episode and comments

on the intruder in a very subjective way; she assigns snake-like attributes to the dangerous attacker countered with his caring and responsible personality. Judging by the actions of the man, his intention was not to make her collapse, not murder her. Apparently, he searched the room after making sure that she is alive albeit unconscious. This kind of behavior resembles the unnamed blond man's, who later in the story caused Anna's car accident and apologetically, took care of her afterwards. In retrospect, the narrating agent, knowing the farmhouse attacker and the blond man to be the same person by analogy reports that the invader felt remorse after hurting her and acted accordingly even though there is no certain proof of it.

There is a similar case of fallible narration that concerns reporting some other character's statements almost verbatim. Any homodiegetic narrator being a part of the story world, under the influence of alcohol can be deemed highly unreliable. It is exactly something that is expected in a scene at the abandoned cattle farm where the blond man took Anna to authenticate the newly acquired painting.

Inside the cattle shed, Anna admits her inebriated state: "I was too drunk to be able to concentrate on what was happening. Your voice was rattling away in the background, trying to explain things to me step by step. [...] I wasn't listening. If only I had listened to you, right from the start" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 189-190). However, just a few minutes later, Anna is reporting and quoting the blond man's explanation verbatim: "See here, where the shadows creep in on her face. The lighter paint is applied on top of the dark, not the other way around, as is more usual. It's the light paint that hits the retina first. Look how focused some parts of the portrait are" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 190). The apparently stunning contrast of the teller's inability and ability to report to readers what the blond man is saying seems surprising and dubious. It would take an instant sobering-up to first offer a vague account, and then almost immediately after, a meticulous attention to detail and the display of the conservator's expertise. Such a moment of attaining full sobriety is missing in the text. Therefore, to explain this case of unreliability, we can retreat to the partnership between the reader and the implied author. The implied author's intention here would be to indirectly and directly show the blond man's character in a completely new light for the first time in the novel. Directly in the sense that his precise description of the painting is quoted word by word, almost completely free from any modifications by the narrator, in this case Anna. It needs to be stressed that Anna's whole story is shaped by her experience and that moments of direct access to any other character's state of mind or direct quotations are rare points in the novel. The readers can deduct from the blond man's elaborate exposition that he is eloquent, confident and that he possesses great knowledge

about Art. Secondly, this disposition sheds light on the blond man as it indirectly depicts his interests and motivation. It seems that he does not pay heed to Anna or her bored and drunken state, which may be evidence of his obsession with the painting. This inference proves very important for the plot as it opens questions about his true care for Anna.

The focus in the following example is on limited perception in narrating and availability of information. After an abrupt and forceful departure from Kel's room, Anna needs to cope with yet another rejection. The narrating-self drifts off to a new topic that slowly introduces the symbolic aspect and the analogy between her and the conservator. The description slows down the action in the story world, and it is an interesting account by the narrator about the history of both the National Gallery and the Grand Plaza hotel, a fictional building in Dublin. This part in the story provides evidence of the author's unreliability (Kilroy, *All Summer* 80-82). What strikes the audience about the description is the content, and its availability and exposition to the narrator. A paragraph about the exterior structure of the National Gallery, the portico, steps and the windows above is purely descriptive and can be considered from a by-stander's position. However, information conflicts with the rest of the account: "It [the glass pyramid] was never intended as a permanent fixture and was only retained until a more suitable location could be found for the Conversation Department" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 80). This kind of information is obviously not available to a simple observer. It seems likely that Anna must have found different ways of acquiring data, such as reading a magazine or a newspaper article to report this statement as it appears to be an exclusive piece of information.

The similar case is on the next two pages where Anna gives details about the long history of the hotel, its initial problems with the construction and the final interior and exterior looks. Anna seems very meticulous about it: "All the best materials were used in the construction. The Portland stone came from the same quarry as that from which the Government Buildings were built" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 81). Once again, it is replete with information that could be found in an interview, a TV or radio show, in an article or any media source. There are other ways of obtaining this insider information, however certain doubts arise because at no point in the novel does Anna reveal her source of information. First, at the time of writing, Anna resides on a remote island with limited media coverage (Kilroy, *All Summer* 15). Secondly, her researching skills are under suspicion as well. There are hardly any hints at Anna's education, professional background or personal interests in the text. Furthermore, at the end of the exhaustive account,

she states: “The Grand Plaza is like a big stone playground. It must have been designed by an adult child” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 82). An extensive search would certainly produce the name of the person who designed the hotel, and here Anna admits not to know who the designer is.

All the instances above shed light onto the narrator's unreliability. The verifiability of her reports is under great suspicion because of many contradictory statements, incomplete and incongruous narration.

3.2 Narrative Situation

The narrative situation in Kilroy's *All Summer* is rather complex. The play with narrative levels that appear alternatively in the text becomes even more confounding by the narrator's shifting from being situated at the level of action to distancing herself from the events as a witness of the scene. Nevertheless, all the rhetorical power is at the disposal of the female narrator as she asserts her position to deftly influence the reader(s). If we apply the narratological theory outlined in the previous chapter and incorporate it in Genette's diagram regarding the novels, the table assumes the following pattern:

Relationship / Level (<i>All Summer</i>)	First Level	Second Level
Homo- / intradiegetic (first-person narrative)	Anna as the first-degree narrator of her story about the arrival on the island	Anna recounting the story of the pinched painting, her relationship with Kel and the blond man
Extradiegetic (third-person narrative)	Does not apply	Anna as the narrator of the story about the conservator, the Nordic assistant, and the investigation Anna as a narrator of the (alleged) correspondence between Kel and the blond man rendered in dialogue

Table 1: The narrators and the narrative levels (*All Summer*)

At the first level of the narration, the story world is recounted by Anna Hunt, who is its central character. In this context she is a homodiegetic narrator and the main protagonist. Similarly, at the second level, the narrative situation remains the same with just one exception – Anna is now part of the second-degree narrative and, therefore, assumes the role of an intradiegetic narrator. The presence of two relatively conflicting story lines at the second level of the action further complicates the narrative process. Because Anna is absent as a character in these two third-person narratives, these storylines stand in a rather peculiar relationship with the story retold by the intradiegetic narrator. As a result, she can be referred as the extradiegetic narrator. Anna Hunt observes not only the conservator, his movements and actions rather carefully, but also monitors the characters in his vicinity – the director of the National Gallery, the detective Sebastian McDonagh, and the Nordic assistant.

The next hypodiegetic narrative recounted by Anna Hunt as the extradiegetic narrator concerns the collaboration between Kel and his accomplice, who turns out to be the blond man / conservator. This brief narrative is sporadic, dialogic and graphically different from the rest of the text since it is italicized. Similarly, this conversational dialogue apparently resurfaces in Anna's mind as there are no other pieces of evidence in the novel to prove otherwise. It follows what seems to be a series of telephone conversations between Kel and his shady accomplice about obtaining the information from Anna regarding the stolen painting. The process is thwarted as she has lost any memory of its whereabouts. The readers also learn how Anna imagines the hierarchy to be between Kel and the blond man / conservator, and thus she gradually creates a picture of the latter as a mastermind and the one who has the upper hand in the entire operation. Hence the function of this hypo-narrative is an explanatory one.

Regarding the function of hypodiegetic narratives, the thematic role of the narrative pertaining to the conservator is worth being investigated. Strikingly, Anna never actually knew or met the conservator she refers to in her story, yet she dedicated an entire storyline to him. As it turns out, it is the blond man's secret occupation, which further disconcerts the audience. Nevertheless, her meticulous inspection and observation of the events at the conservator's workplace indicate that there must be some acquaintance. This is, however, subverted by her extradiegetic position, which leads to the conclusion that the entire sub-narrative may be fabricated. A clue to this inference seems to be her bold admission that the Nordic assistant may be purely fictional: “[p]erhaps she is

Oriental. Perhaps she is a tiny Japanese girl, with a doll's round face and shiny bobbed hair. No: it is important that she looks like she could have fallen out of a Raphael painting" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 42). A persuasive evidence that the entire subplot is a fabrication may be her reaction to hearing the word "conservator" from the blond man for the first time: "So what are you? A conservator. That threw me. I had never heard the word before. [...] What in the name of fuck is a conservator?" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 200). Interestingly, shortly after discovering the blond man's hidden occupation, she departs and never sees him again. It is safe to assume that the entire storyline with the conservator as a central figure functions as an imaginary love story. The readers become aware of a growing intimacy between the conservator and the Nordic assistant, whereas, the blond man and Anna fall victims to a cruel fate, and thus end up as star-crossed lovers. Therefore, this analogous relationship may suffice to exemplify the thematic function of the narrative.

The entire narrative of Anna as the sole intradiegetic narrator fulfils a double purpose: explicative and persuasive. The explicative function of the narrative provides a different view of the events that occurred in Anna's quest for the missing painting. The stance is different in the sense that the blond man (to whom this secondary narrative is retold) may learn about her experience and the view of their mutual relationship as well as the history between her and Kel.

On the other hand, pertaining to the persuasive function of the second-degree account, the goal of the female narrator-protagonist is to persuade the blond man into burying her brother's body (Kel). Afterwards, he should join her on the island (Kilroy, *All Summer* 235). Unfortunately, the readers do not discover the resolution of her wish for redemption and romantic love as the novel has an open ending.

3.3 Narrative Time

3.3.1 Sequence

Chapter 2, paragraph 1 discusses the play in sequencing order and how these deviations in narrative bring about various interpretations. The following chapter will explore the evidence in more detail.

Many accidents in the novel *All Summer* have two or more contradictory interpretations – some of which are revealed only later in the story. Such is the case with Anna's car crash accident after which

she lost consciousness for the second time. The event was explained immediately after the main protagonist's partial recovery:

You had found me on the road and brought me to a hospital, you explained. We had gone there together in an ambulance, straight after the crash. They had released me from Accident and Emergency that same night, after few initial tests and x-rays. A few hammers on the reflexes, torches in the eye. Count my fingers, miss. Count them yourself. She seems all right, sir. We don't need to keep her here. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 126)

This was later contrasted with a realization of the truth:

And that was all that I could remember. No nurses, no sharp lights, no asking of my name for the file. Just you. And then it came to me. It came to me and I could barely breathe. It came to me as steadily as the night clears to make way for the day: that I had never been brought to any hospital. Which meant. Which meant. That you had lied. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 197)

The narrator deftly manipulates her audience. Intentionally, the storyteller introduced a premise that she herself knows is false. A reading sophistication is required to detect mockery in Anna's retelling of the hospital staff's instructions. The initial version of the accident is taken as a basis for building a relationship of trust and mutual confidence between Anna and her "savior", leading the readers to believe in the blond man's good will. However, at the end of the narrative, Anna dismisses the first account by contradicting it with a revelation about the (mis)treatment of her injury. This altogether creates an effect of surprise and disbelief when the truth is disclosed.

3.3.2 Summary

In the paragraph on *summary*, Chatman elaborates on the presupposition of the use of duration as a narrative technique. As he states, a desire to write and its resulting satisfaction are two grounds for condensing the narrative into *summary*. They are based on the subjective experience of the narrator, in the case of this study the first-person narrator, Anna Hunt.

Summaries in *All Summer* are quite rare. It is questionable if the events that are recorded by way of summary are less important than the ones in which the time of action is prolonged by scenic

representation. Nevertheless, it can be argued that one of the reasons why the narrator opted for a summary may be her loss of memory and the emotionally charged experience of the events:

The entire operation was masterminded by Kel. He conceived the plan to steal the paintings, and with my help he executed it. He was the one who organized selling on two of them for the briefcase full of money. I think he believed he was selling them to private collectors. I was not involved in the sale. The paintings didn't go back to the collection from which they'd been stolen. They ended up in the National Gallery. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 34)

Such a theft alone must have taken at least months of devising and the sale could have been already set up. Nevertheless, the months or years of devising such a cunning plan, the following sale and the return of paintings to the gallery have been abbreviated into a couple of sentences. The intricacies of the cunning plan, its development and realization are not mentioned.

Soon after the sale of the two paintings, the inevitable fight and the following physical clash with Kel took place, all of which is no longer familiar to her: “[t]he details of the incident are still unclear in my mind” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 34). It is not uncommon for Anna (as a narrating agent) to pause in the narrative process and to take a breath or rest from the emotional strain of retelling the events, and in the case of this summary, to quickly go through the whole painful ordeal and not to keep the readers in the dark about what had happened. In either case, she has the control of how much information the audience is allowed to access, which is exactly why certain doubts about her truthfulness arise.

This leads to another possible interpretation which concerns her previous personality – “I had become someone else by the time I'd reached the stables” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 33). It remains vague what kind of a person Anna was before the incident with Kel, but what is certain is that a change in personality might have occurred – “[t]hey say a fugue is like a safety valve. When it gets too much, you become someone else” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 33). What we are told as readers is that she never stood in the way of the entire operation, was a loyal accomplice, and that Kel was the mastermind. In a way, her statements are a kind of confession with devious self-justifications. Nevertheless, the reader may be in the dark as to what has led to the physical conflict and the separation between the siblings. It rather seems that Anna was not as guiltless as she presents herself to be (Kilroy, *All Summer* 34). Without doubt, the cut was traumatic for Anna and “the shock of the physical attack, the shock of blade on skin, of blade sinking into skin and moving fast, the shock must have wiped my [her] memory clean” (34). I claim that this

summary of carefully selected events is another cog in the wheel of seduction. Events that would make her appear as a schemer or a criminal are completely left out; she uses this guise of an innocent accomplice not to cause any suspicion about her criminal nature in the conservator's mind. Otherwise, it would disrupt her goal of seduction.

Kilroy's masterfully joined summary and spaces of indeterminacy to blur one part in Anna's history of her relationship with Kel. It is the part of the past that hides answers to questions about their hate-love relationship.

3.3.3 Descriptions of Scenes

Chapter 21 in *All Summer* is almost entirely recounted in a scenic mode. Anna, the third-person narrator, assumes a role of a bystander and from an external position describes a scene where she herself as a character is present alongside the blond man:

The two people standing by the side of the road – they are barely visible. The jeep beside them is more clearly defined, seems to hold onto the ground more firmly than they. The farmhouse to the left of them is, no doubt, still there to this day. As is the tower beside it. Will be there for years. [...] The two lost strangers, the man and the woman who are gazing down the road with their hands in their pockets, they are unverifiable. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 168)

This scene is a moment in Anna's past, observed from a distance in space and time. The narrator at the present time laments the transience and the lack of truthfulness of the characters and the bond they once had. Simultaneously, it foregrounds the impending break up. Story time is decreased as the narrator from her cottage takes more time to contemplate the gravity of the situation it marked. As from that moment on, the blond man's intentions became visible and his obsession with finding the painting, while his interest in Anna apparently subsided.

The continuation in describing the landscape takes a different turn:

They are vanishing steadily, those aimless figures on the road. We are evanescent gradually, like print fading in the sun. A wave of nausea in my belly and we are gone together. [...] The shadows are barely beneath us anymore in my memory of us on the road, as though the sun had gone in, though it blazed all day like an inferno that summer. Shone right through us though. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 169)

The narrator zooms out of that scenery and directs attention to the current view on the silhouettes in the picture as fading images of her memory. The narrative transition from “they” to “we” is sudden and clears out any doubt about who the figures on the landscape are meant to represent. The narrator includes herself in the image she was describing and establishes a break in narrative levels.

3.3.4 Slow-down

As has already been explained, *slow-down* is a device for recounting events in which the narrated time is significantly extended. As in most literary works of fiction, slow-downs are rare in *All Summer* as well. No matter how rare they may seem to be, the analysis of the less frequent application of slow-downs, i.e. the alternation or succession of narrated events brings fruitful results. The presence of these perspective-shifting moments signifies important points in the narrating process. For instance, the excerpt below shows one of those moments: “I eventually find the cottage door and unlock the back door. The cat comes trotting out to have a look at me. He has tears running down his face. [...] The conservator unlocks the studio door. The rain is falling heavily on the ceiling now” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 28).

The transition between the main protagonist and the conservator carries more than just a shift between two characters. First of all, there is a movement from one story line to another. The first part concerns Anna Hunt and her final settlement on the island, whereas the second describes the conservator's arrival at the National Gallery and marks the start of the painting's restoration. The two story lines are repeatedly interwoven using the same slow-down technique. It can be claimed that, so far in the novel, the transition between the story lines is done exclusively by the use of slow-downs as they converge and diverge.

The second major difference between the stories divided by the slow-down is the change in narrative situation. It is a common practice in *All Summer* that the first-person narration is substituted with the second- or third-person narration, and the shifts are more randomized as the novel progresses. However, slow-downs mark a shifting narrative flow between Anna and the conservator, and the accompanying point of view. Remarkably, Anna remains present in both story lines, either as a first-person protagonist or as third-person narrator. This raises the question of her reliability as an author.

Interestingly, the observed manner of focus shifts occurs mostly before Kel's introduction in the novel. Afterwards, slow-downs, as narrative ways of connecting the two star-crossed lovers are rare. This may suggest the discontinuity this new character brings in the story, as his eventual death separates Anna and the blond man for good.

Thirdly, the similarity of the connected situations the conservator and Anna find themselves in is not coincidental. This similarity enhances the bond between the characters and Kilroy uses subtle analogies. In the aforementioned paragraph from the book, descriptive motifs like the cat's tears and the rain falling on the ceiling enhance the spatial dimension as a connecting point.

3.3.5 Ellipsis

A single instance of ellipsis in *All Summer* bears attributes of a typical narratorial omission. The event(s) elided in the text take place in a dingy café, where the female narrator-protagonist placed herself at an exact time – “There was an all-night café across the road. I took myself inside and ordered coffee. It was 3 a.m. according to the clock, though it was still 3 a.m. when I looked up later” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 92). Later she retires to the disgusting toilette, where she accidentally finds and inspects a hole in the wall, hidden behind a postcard on a cardboard frame. This brief bathroom episode abruptly ends with a sudden realization – “It had given me an idea” (93). In the next paragraph Anna enters the Grand Plaza's lobby at exactly 4 a.m. It remains a mystery what Anna was doing in the café after she had an epiphany and before she left the café.

It can be logically inferred that certain events occur in that interim, even though no textual space is devoted to them. The events are not perceived; however, in a letter to the conservator, Anna instructs him how to find the hole in the café and the money she had hidden there. Apparently, Anna devised the whole short treasure hunt to make a request: “Do me one last favour when you get the money. Find out where Kel is and bury him properly. I miss him, and all his beloved perfection” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 233).

Prior to her epiphany, the main protagonist escaped torture from Kel, took the money from the hotel's safe and fled to the café. As the readers later discover, there she got the idea of hiding the rest of the money into the hole, and re-sealing it with the cardboard, resting assured that the

money will not be accidentally found because “dirt and neglect seem to offer safe harbour” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 232).

There are many instances of Anna's remorse and inability to cope with the death of her twin brother, like the scene when the blond man had to break into the bathroom to reach her (Kilroy, *All Summer* 159). Therefore, it can be argued that one of the motives to write the testimony to Kel's murderer in the first place is to ask him to bury her twin brother's body. However, the act of placing the money in the hole is not mentioned, not because it would “overburden the narrative”, but because the actor wanted to keep the conservator in ignorance of the money location until the end of the letter. Thus, he is conditioned to read her whole testimony before finding out about the money. This actor's tactic can be interpreted as a textual revenge and an act of seduction. Through suspense, the conservator is obliged to read the entire letter, and while reading experience Anna's painful expositions, only to find out about materialistic gain at the end of the novel.

3.3.6 Narrative Pause

As stated in the chapter on time in narrative, pauses mark a break in the action on the story level, whereas the discourse continues. In *All Summer*, pauses occur quite often. Each time there is a pause, ruminations about Anna and her emotional state indirectly enter the reader's mind, or the conservator's. The pauses play a vital role of seducing her reader (the conservator) and to make him feel compassion towards her. To that effect, Anna breaks the narration deftly to leave the conservator thinking about her and ultimately feel sympathy.

One such clear attempt at gaining sympathy can be found on page 89 in *All Summer*. After an intense scene, in which Anna suffers the pain of a scalpel on her skin again, she runs out of Kel's room. The following chapter starts with a description of the painting *Girl in the Mirror*. The narrator describes the girl and her surroundings, analyzes details, and questions the possible symbolism in this work of art. While doing so, she draws on many allusions to the close resemblance between her and the girl in the mirror by the use of analogies:

Someone is watching the girl in the mirror. Someone has been following her through the chambers and antechambers of her life. But the girl in the mirror is unaware that

she is being watched. She is too busy looking in the wrong place. The girl in the mirror should learn to be more careful. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 91)

In retrospect, the narrator comments on the figure in the painting considering the danger she herself was in at that interim. Anna has escaped Kel's torture in the story world, and in this instance of narrative pause the narrator uses suspense and bad omens to accentuate her position as a defenseless victim using analogies and allusions. Furthermore, as Cohan and Shires claim one of the most effective techniques to draw attention to the narrating agency, in this case Anna, is pause. Combined with reader address, it is a powerful tool in seducing the reader to gain interest, trust and sympathy.

3.4 Focalization

The girl in the mirror is unaware that she is being watched. She is depicted in a dim room, her back to the viewer. It is clear from the swing of her clothes that she has halted abruptly. Something caught her eye. Her reflection? This is the first thing that troubles the conservator about the painting. [...] So why does the face in the frame look more like a portrait of an entirely different girl, and not like a reflection at all? The conservator removes his glasses and rubs his eyes. It is the girl in the frame's expression that unnerves him. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 89)

This excerpt marks the beginning of the thirteenth chapter and is interesting to investigate as the use of focalization is greatly exploited to suit the narrator's needs. First, the readers are presented with a figure (the girl) in the painting that is being observed by an unknown person ("being watched"), which makes her the focalized object or the focalized. Second, it is suggested that she glances at *something* (the focalized). Since it may be a reflection the girl is peering at, the focalized object coincides with the focalizer who perceives. Third, the person scrutinizing the painting, or the conservator focalizes the entire image and reflects upon the work of art. Therefore, the girl as the focalized is just one piece of the bigger focalization puzzle in the story. In this respect, the conservator can be regarded as the character-focalizer because he exists in the hyponarrative. Furthermore, the entire episode is narrated by Anna Hunt (narrator-focalizer), whose position highlights the conservator as both the focalizer and the focalized at the level of action. Lastly, whereas the girl in the mirror and her reflection are viewed from outside or externally focalized, the conservator is focalized from within (*troubles* and *unnerves*). He is perceived through internal

focalization since the narrator recounts what the protagonist sees in the painting, which facilitates the readers' access to his train of thought. Moreover, from the focalization point, the question he asks himself represents a dissonant psycho-narration, as his doubts are cited verbatim and viewed by the external narrator-focalizer.

The whole previous scene may be an allegory of the situation the main protagonist finds herself in the novel. The readers may come to the conclusion that the girl in the mirror is Anna as the character on the level of action. Her unknown observer in the painting could most certainly be Kel. What the painting and the storyline that revolves around Kel and Anna have in common is the same observer – the conservator. After all, Anna as the narrator-focalizer introduces this imagined scene where the conservator works on the *Girl in the Mirror* to subtly criticize his involvement and collaboration with Kel in order to obtain the painting.

The narrator of the entire second-degree narrative opts for a two-sided perspective of the traffic accident, introducing the blond man's perspective first (Kilroy, *All Summer* 126) and then countering it with a completely different account at the moment when Anna, as the experiencing self and the narrator-focalizer, fully remembers the incident (195). This type of focalization is also known as many-sided or multiple focalization.

A change in focalizers can occur in more sophisticated ways than in the case of multiple focalization. The alternation of focalizers may be signaled by language, as Rimmon-Kenan explains when discussing the naming of certain protagonists in the story. In this study, the focus will be put on the direct and indirect characterization and the labeling of the characters by both the narrator-focalizer and character-focalizer. The application of this narrative strategy is most apparent in giving epithets to the two male characters – Kel and the unnamed conservator / blond man.

Shortly before the moment of Kel's first appearance in the story, he is referred to by astonishing contrasting attributes. On the one hand, he is initially focalized by the narrator-focalizer Anna, who presents Kel rather negatively to the readers, characterizing him as "a ghost", "a wraith" or "an apparition" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 61-63). This "shadow" is further described in terms of animalistic vocabulary – "a fox" or a "shark-like" figure who "is no better than a dog sometimes" (101), "smelled like a wild animal" (105), and hisses like a snake (171). As can be seen, these descriptions

range from immaterial beings to brutes, which is how he appears to Anna as her memories come flooding back.

Moreover, the author's use of synecdoche, or "a common figure of speech (or trope) by which something is referred to indirectly"⁴, underlines Kel's dangerous and mischievous qualities. He is presented to the readers with frequent depictions of his smile, and especially his teeth: "'Yes,' I said to Kel's mouth, and Kel's mouth smiled. Those teeth! Sharp and white. I blinked at them several times. Another blinding smile, and then he turned and left the breakfast room, just like that, without another word" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 64). In addition to the previous statements, expressions like "dagged" and "feline" smile accentuate the dreadful effect he imposed on Anna, and the traumatized state caused by the incident when Kel had cut her face with a knife (34). Lastly, the narrator-focalizer accuses Kel for collaborating with the blond man in their joint venture to get hold of the painting unbeknown to Anna, calling him the "traitor" and "my exquisite Judas" (64).

On the other hand, the voice of Anna as the character-focalizer praises Kel for his beauty and remarkable physical features. After a couple of nights spent with him in his hotel room where they smoked weed, she became to be sexually attracted to him: "Desire is a strange animal. I should know. When he recoiled from me, I would turn my face aside, and instantly comprehend that I wanted him more than ever" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 74). Anna, when intoxicated, obviously finds him attractive. It should be considered, however, that at this point, she is the one unaware that Kel is her sibling, which explains why he "recoiled" from her. The character-focalizer's scarce descriptions have almost exclusively positive connotations until the second violent encounter occurs at the hotel, when Kel cuts her back using a box-cutting knife (Kilroy, *All Summer* 88). After that "he was no longer a column of light, but a shadow of a human being" (94). Despite that, her true feelings emerge the moment of the final clash between them, when she hit him with a lamp: "I was apologizing to him as soon as I made contact. No, I was apologizing to him in the split second before I made contact. I was already regretting it before I did it to him. I had never wanted to hurt my beautiful Kel" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 112). These statements are uttered by Anna as the character-focalizer and remain unedited by the NF. The use of synecdoche recurs shortly after, however in a positive sense: "[a]nd the lamp-stand came down again as if it had done so itself, and Kel collapsed once more, and this time it was his teeth that I heard as they hit the tiles.

⁴ Baldick, Chris. "Synecdoche." *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2015.

He landed right on his teeth. I heard them crack. I had broken his smile. His exquisite smile” (112). Anna (CF) even confesses to the blond man later in the novel that Kel was “the most beautiful thing that I [she] had ever seen” and that she “couldn’t go beyond the fact of his beauty” (163).

The reason for recounting these scenes of violence is blatantly put forward by the narrator when she comments on the sensation experienced: “Maybe I am trying to absolve myself by demonising him [Kel]. The things I say to justify how I felt about him. There are no ways of justifying how I felt about him. His touch did not feel like it should have felt, but then, I am feeling it again and again not as it was, but with the benefit of hindsight, if you could call hindsight a benefit. I call it a curse [sic]” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 64). She admits having been mistaken when judging him, hence her deprecating portrayals of Kel should be viewed with caution.

Regardless of the positive or negative attributes which Anna as the character- or the narrator-focalizer assigns to Kel, depictions of his more devious collaborator, the conservator / blond man, tend to be presented in a more sophisticated manner. Whereas Anna as the narrator-focalizer alternates her descriptions from sarcastic to incriminating, the character-focalizer slowly distances herself from the blond man, when she perceives the alteration in his behavior.

The narrator-focalizer occasionally addresses an unnamed person with “you”, however, the identity of that person is revealed only after the car accident:

That was when you entered my tale. I was halfway through it on a hiding to nothing, and had never considered the possibility of the intervention of a stranger. You told me how you had seen the whole thing from the hill, those two mad cars racing the black countryside, one spinning violently, the other in full pursuit. Did I, careening around in the back of the driverless one, twist my head and glimpse your silhouette on the eastern horizon? Did I watch it run towards me, that jet-black shape? That it was you? Did I? No. There was none of that. None at all. I have much to be grateful for. Our bond was natural. A choice, I told myself, not a fate. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 119-120)

In retrospect, the narrator labels this person a “stranger” with a “jet-black shape” stressing his foreignness and ominousness. Moreover, the audience discovers that this “silhouette” was the vehicle of focalization referring to the witness of the incident, which makes him a character-focalizer, and Anna the focalized. The succession of rhetorical questions in the quoted interior monologue above only highlights the made-up scenario, according to which he urgently approached her. Her repeated rejection of his assistance reveals fraudulence as another trait of this

dark figure. A careful reading of the narrator's account here would reveal a sarcastic note in her voice.

In the beginning of the following chapter, Anna as the CF wakes up in a house of the same unfamiliar person, however her perception is in stark contrast to the narrator-focalizer's. At that moment she names him the "blond man", whose hair yields to the wind "like a cornfield" (124), and who runs to her as she falls to the ground in "that warm room flushed through a sun-bleached whiteness" (125). The writer applies the same literary figure (synecdoche) as in the descriptions of Kel and adds a conceit or "an unusually far-fetched or elaborate metaphor or simile presenting a surprisingly apt parallel between two apparently dissimilar things or feelings"⁵, comparing his hair with a cornfield to effectively articulate her surprise.

The audience is repeatedly faced with the presence of two focalizers who are basically the same person, delivering a narrative in retrospect or while experiencing the events. Their presence is marked by conspicuously different naming of the blond man, whose descriptions dominate the entire novel. This alteration continues approximately until the moment she gets hold of the painting from the bank: "You held me by the elbow and guided me to the jeep. We drove off with a skid and the parking ticket on your windscreen flapped like a startled bird. Eventually it blew off" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 179). Even though there are few signs of his shady intentions prior to this scene, such as the one when he apparently threatened her (146), Kilroy's clever use of the conceit (comparison of the flapping bird and the ticket on the wind) indirectly marks a crucial transition in the blond man's character. Now the character-focalizer paints a disparate picture of a man who no longer masks his fervent interest in the painting as he forcefully escorts her to the vehicle and ignores the fact that he violated traffic rules.

However, the branding that most clearly reveals the highly complicated relationship between Anna as the narrator-focalizer and the blond man, is "my poor murderous conservator" (220). Apparently, she feels pity for a man who admittedly killed her brother. Even though she accuses him of being a fake when she says: "[s]ometimes I think that the only thing that is real about you is the missing tip of your middle finger. Like my scar, it is the one thing that can never be concealed" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 225), she can't help but feel sympathy to him "Like my scar, it indicates that ... That

⁵ Baldick, Chris. "Conceit." *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2015.

what? I don't know. Many things. That you are not perfect. That you are damaged goods. That you have also been through the wars" (225).

The blond man shifts his approach as he somewhat patiently waits for Anna's memory to be rekindled. During that time, he gains her trust, which makes her disappointment even greater. Nevertheless, the mixed feelings mark Anna's unstable emotional state and the shifting attitude that affects the naming.

3.5 Metafiction and Metanarration

Claire Kilroy's works are replete with literary devices. Such is the case with *All Summer*, in which the narrator feels the compulsion to constantly direct readers' attention to herself and thus, the process she is going through to write the story. Reasons may vary – from asking the readers for compassion and empathy as she is overwhelmed with emotions while writing the lines, to divulging the gaps in her memory and supplementing them with figments of her imagination. Nevertheless, the actuality of the story is endorsed by Anna's frequent self-references. An example of metafiction from the novel is below:

How can I produce him in the middle of my chaos? Where could I possibly place him that he would make the same impact on my words as the impact he made on my head when I saw him in the flesh? [...] I shall place him by a window. That should do it. I shall place him by a window in the morning light, and that is how I will remember the first time, though it was not the first time, no. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 62)

Hesitantly and carefully, the narrating-self is trying to introduce an important figure into the narrative, whose creation has an impact on the experiencing-self. The struggle to find a suitable place in the narrative and directly affect the realism in the story could be attributed to metafiction, as it can be perceived that the narrator discloses the writing process in its effect on the story.

Another instance of metafiction concerns the narrator's instructions to one of the characters:

The conservator calls her name. He will draw her into the centre of the room when she appears. Look, he will say, and point to the veiled ceiling. Look at that.

Especially for you. Like being in an igloo, what? (No! For God's sake don't say that to her: wrong bloody country. She'll think you're an idiot. Just wish her Happy Christmas.). (Kilroy, *All Summer* 213)

The narrator is interfering in the conservator's attempts to be romantic and seduce the Nordic assistant. In other words, the third-person narrator has access to the character's mind and tries to intervene from a position of a mere teller. The story-teller breaks the fictionality of the narrative and deliberately influences the conservator's speech and thus the discourse of the story.

Unlike metafictional utterances, metanarrative comments stay on the level of discourse, as can be viewed in the following examples. The first instance accentuates the fictionality of the narrative: "I have difficulty visualising the first betrayal. I imagine it went something like that. I fight with myself over Kel's line" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 65). Evidently, the hardships of writing interject the story world. Second, the narrator is simply lost for words: "Look at me lying to you. Lying to your face. A liar is just another word for ... Nope. Couldn't finish that one" (Kilroy 75). Or even the upsurge of emotions affect the process of writing: "You turned the jeep out onto the open road and I must catch my breath for a second, because it is ending in my head all over again and I can hardly bear to go through with it, even in retrospect" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 165).

The three examples are evidence of Anna's difficulty to write and finish certain lines of her confessional narrative. She seems overwhelmed with emotions and she needs to pause for moment, thought or breath. At the level of narrative transition, the narrator's comments are self-referential and provide more information about the emotional state she is in, inability to come up with an appropriate word(s) to finish the sentence or the internal conflict over giving voice to Kel.

On the basis of Macrae's classification of types of metanarration, a study about the metanarrative comments in Kilroy's novels can be carried out. There appear to be instances of almost all metanarrative categories in *All Summer*, mainly due to the overt narrator figure and her frequent disruptive and invasive acts of telling. One of the earliest instances of metatextual metanarration occurs, when Anna, as the extradiegetic narrator, struggles to introduce another character (Kel) into her story: "I didn't want him to be real. I wanted him to be like Isolde, *mere ink and paper* like Isolde, but he was not like her. He was flesh and blood and bodily heat, in the best and the worst kind of way" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 63; emphasis added). The narrator refers to one of the characters in the storyworld as "mere ink and paper" (corresponding to Macrae's definition of metatextual metanarration) to foreground the writing process and textual inscription. The readers are aware that

Isolde Chevron is the name in the passport with Anna Hunt's picture, and will suspect that the document is a fake, meant to be used in case of a potential escape outside the borders of Ireland. However, the false identity reminds Anna of Isolde's immaterial existence in contrast to Kel, whose mere extratextual existence haunts her even after he passed away. The following instances of the same type of metanarration signal Anna's strong emotional bond to the character of Kel, the memory of whom remains a burden to her writing practice: "I fight with myself over Kel's line (Kilroy, *All Summer* 65). The extradiegetic narrator refers to herself as the writer recording down her recollections on paper. This practice is evidently linked with the forming and composing of the narrative, which falls into the domain of metacompositional metanarration. The following example best illustrates the concept:

When was that? July, maybe? A July night, late June at the earliest. I should try and hold onto some of the facts. I feel it all ebbing away from me with the slow onslaught of forgetfulness, and there seems not a thing I can do about that, except try and hold onto the barest of the details. It was July, the Grand Plaza Hotel, late at night. These things mean nothing to me though. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 108)

The narrator featuring as an author is reflecting upon the creation and formation of the narrative unit. Interestingly, she simultaneously displays her power of controlling the narration of the discourse and exposes her weakness of becoming a fallible teller when she complains of gradually losing her memory. A similar case of metadiegetic metanarration centers around her reminiscence of the night she spent with the blond man at his house:

I can't remember what we'd been doing. Talking, probably, or maybe you were cooking. That's it. You were cooking, with your back to me, and you had a big knife in your hand. It was probably just a wooden spoon, but I will call it a big knife. And I will say that you were slicing meat with great enthusiasm. Red bloody meat, though it was probably an onion. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 184)

The meandering narration is continuously adjusted to most precisely indicate the narrator's current judgment of the blond man. In that respect the setting and, consequently the characterization, is constructed ad hoc by the pseudo-authorial narrator (Macrae). Words like "a big knife" and "red bloody meat", contrasted to "just a wooden spoon" and "an onion", symbolically indicate the sinister and murderous past of the blond man. Moreover, the subtle reference to the bloody murder scene strikingly differs from the cosiness of his home. Hence the effect on readers is discomforting and dramatic. At an earlier point, Anna as the narrator reflects on the possible outcomes if the blond man had not taken her home. "Home. How easily that slipped out" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 126). Here

the narrator pauses to reconsider her choice of words in the creating process as her idea of home no longer seems legitimate. There are also metanarrative comments in which the narrator refers to the plot structure and status of the ontological storyworld: “I should finish the tale, get over with, but suddenly I feel so tired” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 167) or similarly, “I am losing interest in the telling” (184). By mentioning “the telling” of “the tale”, the narrator acknowledges the (written) form of the narrative, as well as the plot arrangement, exposing the diegesis of the novel. This example may fall under the category of metanarrative metanarration as it touches upon narrative conventions in relation to the narrator. The final type of metanarration (metadiscursive metanarration) occurs very frequently due to the overt and intrusive narrator, whose comments extend to the discourse and its discursive members as well, as it can be shown in the following quotation: “I was picking road grit out of the heel of my hand. I turned my head, and there you were, this man, this you. No, not yet you. Just this man who gradually became you” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 127). The narrator Anna Hunt recalls the moment from her memory when the blond man has given her a lift in his car after the accident. In her statements she exposes his transition from an unfamiliar and distant “this man” to the more intimate “you”. The reader will notice the intruding narrator who addresses the character as “a character” with the deictic pronoun “you” (Macrae). Therefore, the narrator acknowledges the existence of the character at the discursive level, thus unsettling the audience.

The following passage from *All Summer* provides evidence for the use of various types of metanarration converging:

Kel was never his name. I should say these things now lest I forget to correct myself and my version becomes the official one. [...] I have no desire to speak his real name, so in my mind I started indexing him as Kel. [...] And then there is you, the problem of you. Whatever shall I call you, what with the protection of identity and all of that? (Kilroy, *All Summer* 162)

The analysis shows the presence of multiple categories of metanarration in this excerpt, namely metatextual, metacompositional, and metadiscursive. The metatextual component can be demonstrated by Anna’s awareness of the “official version of her testimony” and “the protection of identity”, since the effect of her expose may bring liability to the characters outside the narrative at some extratextual level. The metacompositional category of metanarration is reflected in the narrator’s wavering style of writing. Anna’s seemingly provisory selection of the characters’ names indicates her concern for their true identities and reveals her creative thought process. Finally, the

last question undermines the dialogic and discursive note of the narrator as “I” who addresses the character as “you”, which is a feature of metadiscursive metanarration (Macrae).

All Summer has plenty of metanarrative signs and metaleptic commentaries. The narrator frequently comments and interprets what has been previously recounted, like in the following example of a metanarrative sign: “Sold everything that I could remove from the jeep – your camera, your toolbox, the car stereo and CDs, even your sunglasses (which, I noted, were a pretty fancy make – dear Mr Conservator, I’d never have thought of you as vain!)” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 220). After departing from the conservator’s house and fleeing eastward in his jeep, Anna desperately needs resources, hence the sale of his valuables. The remark she makes about the brand of his sunglasses refers to a trait of his personality that has previously been unknown to her and the readers. By addressing him as “Mr Conservator”, she mockingly expresses her surprise at his seeming self-centeredness. Thus, Anna as the narrator reaffirms her role as intruding narrator, who imposes her judgment on readers.

In addition, metaleptic transgressions contribute to indirect characterization of the main protagonist, which can be seen from the final scene of the hyponarrative. On New Year’s Eve, the conservator enters the toilette of the National Gallery in search of the distressed Nordic assistant:

One finger is all it takes to wipe away a sea nymph’s tears. The things you had to do for me, when she requires so little. [...] You and I did not last the summer. I am jealous of a girl who doesn’t exist. Look up at your ceiling and you will see me stretched across it, watching you through the hole that I’ve made in the snow: web-fingered, amphibious, stricken. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 216)

An attentive reader will perceive the analogy between this scene and the earlier episode when Anna locked herself in the bathroom at the blond man’s house, who had to break it open to reach her (160). This evokes the impression that the narrator of the second-degree narrative evidently created this character in her likeness. Nevertheless, this paragraph discloses that the Nordic assistant’s role is that of the extradiegetic narrator’s antithesis. During her time at the blond man’s house, Anna as the experiencing agent and focalizer repeatedly refers to summer, the end of which marks their separation. Consequently, Anna as the narrating voice introduces this clone who comes from a cold Northern country and “requires so little” as opposed to her own needs.

Therefore, this metaleptic intrusion has a more striking effect on the readers. First, Anna as the extradiegetic narrator unexpectedly materializes in the fictional world she recounts, and thus breaks

the frame. According to Genette, this type of transgression may be regarded as both comical and fantastic. These elements arise from the weird and novel combination of Anna's attributes: "web-fingered, amphibious, stricken", suggesting a bizarre and frog-like creature. Her fantastic appearance in the novel recall features of magical realism, which is, however, unlikely because this is an isolated instance. Second, when Anna addresses the conservator from within the story, she not only crosses the boundary between the narrative levels, but also interpellates the characters. Here interpellation can be understood as "the imaginary mechanism of mutual recognition by which ideology operates to constitute concrete individuals as human subjects"⁶. By "looking up" and "seeing" Anna, the conservator, and consequently the Nordic assistant, realize that they are in control of a higher entity, in this case the creator of the story they inhabit.

Third, the metalepsis employed here is marked by two types of metaleptic transgressions, metaleptic awareness and metaleptic communication (Macrae). The first borderline instance is employed here due to the interpellation, although metaleptic communication is one-sided and established "through the hole that I've [Anna] made in the snow" (the symbolical confrontation with the Nordic assistant). Finally, there is another moment of metaleptic communication, when the narrator gives orders to the character, while clearly remaining on a different narrative level: "For God's sake don't say that to her: wrong bloody country. She'll think you're an idiot. Just wish her Happy Christmas" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 213). Here, Anna interferes in the conservator's wording and communicates across narrative levels.

In the two examples above, Anna attempts to approach the characters in the story she narrates. To do so, she needs to break the logical barrier of the narrative discourse, which alerts the readers. These poignant instances of endeavor may be interpreted as Anna's unfulfilled fantasies with the blond man, which are now transposed into the hyponarrative and thus the conservator-Nordic assistant storyline. Any of these transgressions into this storyworld seem unnatural, or even fabulous, and emphasize Anna's feelings of longing and contrition.

⁶ Payne, Michael and Barbera, Jessica Rae. "Interpellation." *A Dictionary of Cultural and Critical Theory*. 2nd Ed. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

3.5.1 The Disnarrated / Denarrated

Claire Kilroy's *All Summer* is replete with disnarrated and denarrated events, whose functions vary from conveying psychological trauma, developing characterization, imaginings, and speculations to the slowing down of narrative action. They both pertain to the narrator and the characters in the novel and are represented by many narrative devices, such as focalization or metafiction.

These types of events are well-communicated in the frequent metafictional accounts by the narrator, such as Anna's ponderings about the consequences of an imagined scenario:

If I did write to the conservator, what, I wonder, would he do with my letters? I want to believe that he would not turn them straight over to the police. I want to believe that he would mull over them for a time. [...] And I don't know much about the conservator, but I doubt he would throw my letters in the fire. He is too sentimental for that. No, not sentimental. [...] To the conservator, my letters, if I wrote to him (which I won't) would be evidence. He would keep all of them. The conservator would study my letters in silence. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 54)

These thoughts suggest that the letters are seen as potential evidence for her participation in the theft and submitting them to the police would considerably alter the plot and subsequent course of action. However, the idea of composing, let alone sending the letters turns out to be only an inkling as Anna completely rejects the idea ("which I won't"). In addition to this thought, the fictional character of the conservator can be understood to be the blond man's alter ego. Therefore, readers learn from these denarrated events that Anna fabricates this person and his actions, although she evokes the impression that she is familiar with the alternative blond man's personality. The conservator stands for a character in the hyponarrative, which would make this excerpt part of a virtual embedded narrative (Marie-Laure Ryan), as it refers to an abstract entity and the narrator's repeated wishes.

As explained in the previous chapter on denarration, a duplicitous narrator engages in disclosing information about the events only to deny their truth or existence afterwards. Anna Hunt as the narrator exemplifies such behavior, which is demonstrated by the dialogue between Sebastian, the detective, and the conservator regarding the ongoing investigation. At the restoration room, after Sebastian has questioned the perpetrators, the busy conservator takes out a letter from the filing cabinet and hands it to him:

'I have received a written confession from a woman called Anna Hunt. After stealing the painting, she appears to have spent some time working in livery stables situated fifteen miles to the north of the city. It's not clear what she was doing there. Hiding, probably.' [...] Naturally, the conservator says nothing of the kind. Nor does he give the detective my letter. There is no letter. I have not written one. When asked what he knows, the conservator turns away from the detective [...]. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 44)

The author, as the duplicitous narrator, skillfully denies in a single passage that two events have indeed happened – the existence of the letter and the conservator's betrayal. Had the detective obtained her address, the remainder of the novel would have revolved around Anna's anticipation of the arrest, or her continuous flight from the police. Either way, it would have thematically modified the core of the story. However, regardless as to whether his explanation is true or false, the entire response is invalidated or denarrated by the narrator. Anna paints a picture of the conservator as a loyal and caring person, whose traits correspond to the blond man's, especially before acquiring the painting.

The most alarming and disconcerting effect on the readers seems to be achieved when the episode of Anna's treatment by the hospital staff is refuted. Prior to the narrative counterfactual, Anna believed in the blond man's story about being taken to the hospital because her loss of memory after the accident left her with no other option. The moment when she is able to recall the incident crucially modifies the narrative:

I tried thinking back to the journey in the ambulance with you by my side, solicitously mopping my forehead, praying that this stranger would pull through. How awful it is to be presented with the almost embarrassing spectacle of someone else's blood. I vaguely remember being scraped off the tarmac and scooped into warm dark arms, but no flashing lights invaded this darkness. No men in white coats. Nothing invaded this darkness at all, except your tenderness. The memory of your tenderness. [...] And that was all that I could remember. No nurses, no sharp lights, no asking of my name for the file. Just you. And then it came to me. It came to me and I could barely breathe. It came to me as steadily as the night clears to make way for the day: *that I had never been brought to any hospital*. Which meant. Which meant. That you had lied. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 196-197)

This denarrated event contributes to the characterization as it exposes, on the one hand, the blond man's deceitfulness and guile, and, on the other hand, Anna's credulous and gullible personality. Her broken speech and reiterated denials intensify when she experiences a moment of epiphany. The repetition of things and events that are not present have never happened abound in the text and prolongs the narration while simultaneously slowing down the speed of action in the story. This

device of decelerating the action constitute the domain of the disnarrated (Prince), like in the following example:

There are no personal effects in the room. In fact, there is nothing in the room at all. [...] There is nothing to remind the viewer that vanity is a sin, that the flesh is mortal, that the flesh will ultimately decay. There are no skulls, ravens, pieces of rotten fruit. No carcasses, coffins, urns, or ashes. Not even a diehard rat. Maybe the mirror is not a symbol of vanity at all. Maybe it is intended as a symbol of truth. The conservator shakes his head. It is rare to come across a canvas so bare. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 90)

The character focalization exposes the thought of the conservator as he inspects the *Girl in the Mirror* (Dannenberg). His mind is racing through the well-known symbols of the painting's tradition, trying to pinpoint the correct one, albeit in vain. Ultimately, the conservator is astounded as he realizes there are virtually none. The listing of non-existent elements in the painting (skulls, ravens, carcasses, coffins, etc.) reduces the speed of action and highlights the conservator's expertise.

Trauma is defined as an “emotional shock following a stressful event or a physical injury”⁷. Anna Hunt displays symptoms of trauma after Kel inflicts violence on her by cutting her back using a knife (Kilroy, *All Summer* 88). What ensues is her immediate escape from the hotel into the polluted street and hot wind: “I needed it to rain then. [...] I needed to have the rain fall on my face in exactly the same way as it would fall on the pavements and roads around me. [...] I would have let go of something had it fallen upon me: my humanity, my sensibility; it would have ebbed away. [...] But it did not rain on me, and I did not feel like stone. I still wanted to kill Kel” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 92). Her wishful desire for a rainfall symbolizes her need for relief from the stress she has experienced. Since there is no rain, her utterances arising from the severe trauma, are an instance of disnarration as defined by Prince.

Similarly, the following episode regarding the disnarrated refers to the character-focalizer and not to the narrator. During the priest's visit to Anna's cottage on the island, she feels disoriented and she has the feeling that he approaches her from behind:

The priest's voice had come from somewhere else. He had moved away from the kitchen table, though I hadn't detected the sound of him standing up, nor heard his footfall. [...] His voice was softer this time. Softer and closer. [...] He must be standing right behind me, about to lay a hand on my shoulder. [...] I waited for the

⁷ <https://www.lexico.com/definition/trauma>

hand on the shoulder, and it did not come. Was the priest just standing there, looking mournfully at the back of my head? [...] The priest was not behind me. He was sitting at the table. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 13)

Anna experiences the priest's presence in the cottage very intensely, and pictures him drawing near in the kitchen. As this scene happens early in the novel, the disnarrated incident evidently introduces the readers to the protagonist's damaged mental, emotional, or psychological state, mainly because it unveils her unreliable side. Anna tends to engage in monologues, ponderings and wishful thinking, which are exposed to the reader's scrutiny.

3.6 Speech Representation

The analysis of Kilroy's *All Summer* reveals that the main protagonist occasionally shifts between first-, third-, and even second-person modes of narration. This chapter begins with a close analysis of the third-person narrative elements in Kilroy's first work of fiction and then explores the device of first-person narration.

Switching from first-person to third-person narrating occurs frequently in contemporary fictional novels. In *All Summer*, the prevailing narrative situation is that of the first person, the passages in third-person revolve around Kel, the blond man, and predominantly the conservator. The female first-person narrator has the authority over reporting their actions as she assumes the position of an all-seeing narrator (extradiegetic narrator). In the following example of the immediate and subtle transition between the two modes of narrating will provide more information:

He starts on the top of the canvas. The blue overprint lifts easily enough. [...] The conservator can proceed immediately with the cleaning process. I [Anna], by now, am in a port town on the south-east coast, thinking of the painting. [...] I have been put in a chair that swivels about on a central pedestal. The chair must be at least twenty years old. The towel that is stuffed down the back of my neck is older than I am. My hair is chopped off. I look at it on the linoleum floor. There is so much of it. What have I done? (Kilroy, *All Summer*, 23-24)

The paragraph illustrates the sophisticated way of switching between the two modes of narration (first-person and third-person) by the use of discreet signal words. These words are pregnant with meaning and point to the uncanny bond by which Anna is tied to the conservator and the painting. The affinity between Anna having her hair cut and the painting's restoration process is suggested

by many hints. First, both the painting and Anna are passive objects that undergo a process of removal (the blue overprint and hair, respectively). Second, a person bending over the object is removing something from it. Third, the author opted for a linoleum floor (opposed to, for instance, a wooden or tiled one), whose properties have similarities to a painting. In the end, the last two parallels refer symbolically to Anna's connection to the conservator – the bent head and uncomfortable towel. It reminds the readers of the towel the conservator had used to tie his broken hand with, symbolizing the bond they have in suffering or discomfort.

The protagonist avoids the first-person narrative situation by “borrowing” the other character's perspective and, thus, diminishing the effect of painful memories. Anna Hunt as CF temporarily takes over the blond man's viewpoint and recounts the terrible episode that ensued after she has realized that she had committed fratricide. The blow-by-blow account starts with the following lines: “I'll have to tell it from your point of view, because I can't even begin to think of it from mine” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 158). She attempts to transfer the pain of reminiscing by observing the situation from the blond man's perspective, which is, however, only partly successful because her own point-of-view is likewise revealed in the narration:

I heard the front door open again, and you took something out of the jeep. The rifle. You slammed down the boot and came in. You worked your way through the rest of the house calling my name. Your tone of voice fluctuated between anger and concern. I followed your progress in my mind's eye. I saw you standing in the corridor outside, gingerly pushing the door open with your fingertips, so that the room was revealed to you without you having to step inside. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 159)

It seems that Anna uses the blond man's figure as a point of reference and vehicle of focalization in order to describe her embarrassing event. She scans his movements with her aforementioned “mind's eye”, referring to all-seeing and omniscient narration.

In this point-of-view narration, elements of dissonant psycho-narration begin to emerge and to play an important role: “You looked at the face again. You crossed to the other end of the table to view it the right way up. Cavernous eyes. Dark lips. Slight smile. It was Isolde Chevron. Wrong. It was supposed to be Kel's face. I can see how you made the mistake though” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 159). The dissonance of the report is evident because of the difference between Anna's and the blond man's visualization of the image formed by salt and sugar on the table. Anna as the intrusive narrator clearly opposes the character's mental perception during the thought narration (Palmer).

It appears that he visualized the pile of salt and sugar as an object of his interest, and thus thought it was Isolde / Anna, whereas, in Anna's point of view, it was Kel whom she had in mind while shaping the grains.

Another rare case of dissonant psycho-narration occurs in a sudden outburst from the narrator. Anna follows the conservator's train of thought:

She [the Nordic assistant] has been wishing all week for snow. The conservator calls her name. He will draw her into the centre of the room when she appears. Look, he will say, and point at the veiled ceiling. Look at that. Especially for you. Like being in an igloo, what? (No! For God's sake don't say that to her: wrong bloody country. She'll think you're an idiot. Just wish her Happy Christmas.) But the conservator does not have to worry about what to say. The Nordic assistant is not around. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 213)

It's important to stress that Anna's insight into the conservator's mind occurred sometime after he had finished restoring "The Girl in the Mirror", the analogy being that the conservator's feelings for Anna have diminished. In short, the conservator, in an inebriated state, calls for his assistant and imagines a possible scenario if courting would take place. The conflict in the narration starts at the moment when the conservator mentions an igloo, thus evoking a stereotype that might offend the Nordic assistant, in Anna's opinion. The narrator clearly interrupts his flow of thought by strongly opposing the possible insult and offers a better line ("Happy Christmas"). This metacommentary is interesting because it openly directs attention to Anna the narrator, who seems to be watchful and helpful to the conservator by offering a better alternative. Some readers might consider this intrusion as an act of possessiveness rather than an expression of jealousy, since the Nordic assistant represents Anna's fictive projection of herself. Hence, the justification for Anna's intervention – the Nordic assistant needs to be wooed and seduced in a manner respectful of Anna herself, devoid of any stereotypical notions.

Instances of consonant psycho-narration seem more common as Anna, the narrator blends with the minds who surround the conservator rather inconspicuously. Such an example is presented early in the novel, when he meets the director of the gallery, who notices the bandage on the conservator's hand:

It's nothing, the conservator tells him. It's only a bit of a bruise. It does not look like a bit of a bruise to the director. He can't see much under the bandage, but he suspects from the way that the conservator has wrapped it that the hand has been crushed. Perhaps even broken. There appears to be some sort of splint under the tea towel.

How can the director allow the conservator to restore such a significant painting with a broken hand? He looks worried. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 22)

Verbs in the paragraph like “see”, “suspects” or “appears” suggest that the act of observation is conveyed through the mind of the director. Furthermore, the question that is asked raises doubts whether it is uttered by the character of the director or by Anna, the narrator, since his tone and mood could be easily mistaken for hers. The puzzlement continues as the conservation is approaching its end: “The director would prefer to ease the conservator back into his job. He cannot take chances with this painting. Nor with the conservator” (Kilroy, *All Summer* 23). The feelings of anxiety about the conservator’s condition can be ascribed to the director and Anna alike as they are both concerned about his state of health at this point in the narration. It is instances like these that obscure the threshold between the character and the narrator as the one telling the event. This ambiguity emphasizes in Anna the feelings of worry and longing for the conservator.

The second character whose thoughts are mediated via consonant psycho-narration is the detective who investigates the case of the pinched painting. Upon the return of the “Girl in the Mirror”, Sebastian McDonagh, the detective, is determined to catch the thieves. full stop. “The conservator, an old acquaintance of his, however, seems to obstruct the investigation intentionally. This becomes obvious in the telephone conversation, when Sebastian tells him that there is little hope of finding the culprits:

The conservator murmured what a shame that was, and replaced the receiver in its cradle. The detective looked with resignation at the phone in his hand. The dial tone wafted out of it. This was precisely the kind of abstruse bullshit that he had lately come to expect from his old friend. It was irritatingly easy for the conservator. What did it matter to him? *Girl in the Mirror* was back. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 53)

The last two statements in this excerpt do not clearly disclose the person who utters them. It can be equally claimed to be the character or the narrator due to the missing signposts. The ambiguity of the statements is, however, deliberate. The detective fails to see that the conservator’s evasiveness has less to do with the wavering friendship they share but more with the conservator’s attempt to obstruct the investigation and not to allow his position to be jeopardized. The consonance in self-narration originates from the blame both Anna and Sebastian lay on the conservator, as shown in this excerpt. It could be argued that Anna implicitly accuses the blond man of acting manipulatively while searching for the painting, whereas Sebastian appears to be irritated by the conservator’s lack

of interest in the investigation after the missing painting is acquired. This would, in turn, explain the inspector's annoyance expressed in the final two utterances of the passage.

In the aftermath of the incident, when Kel uses a scalpel to cut the skin on Anna's back, she starts thinking about their hotel rooms:

[...] I caught myself thinking of those two bedrooms. Our two bedrooms. They would have been identical, were they not inverted versions of each other. Just like us [...] The lights were out in my room. I stood in the corner nearest the door. It was filled with that blue neon light that the city generates. Strange, that – I never stood in the corner in the dark, yet that is how I saw the room when it drifted through my head late last night. I will never quite get it, how the mind reworks everything slightly for no apparent reason, except, of course, to bring home to itself the fact that it can never be trusted. (Kilroy, *All Summer* 97)

This paragraph begins experiencing self telling in the past tense, to move on to the voice of the narrating self, which renders an opposite view (denarration) in comparison to the previous description of the room. What follows is self-narration in which the two voices can hardly be distinguished and are likely to create confusion in the reader, not least because of the use of present tense. The grammar allows for two interpretations as to whose consciousness it is that is represented – the experiencing and the narrating self. Depending on the kind of the voice, there are two plausible interpretations. If we consider the voice to be the narrating-self, then the narrating I or Anna is wiser and knows her account may be faulty because of the many months that have passed since the events occurred, and thus retelling truthfully becomes problematic. The second probable interpretation follows Anna as the experiencing self.

Having the superior position over the experiencing self, given by the knowledge it possesses, the narrating self can thoroughly investigate the doings of the former, and offer judgments and evaluations. One such case in *All Summer* occurs in the hotel room scene at the end of Kel's and Anna's conversation. He admits that he used to have a haircut for a while that resembled Anna's, to which makes Anna ponder: "I was watching an image half forming in my head. It could have been him, I told myself, and then quickly dismissed the idea. How could I have done anything other than dismiss it? I did not know Kel from Adam then. I repeat this knowledge to myself over and over" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 72). Anna, as the narrating self, retells how she reacted to Kel's responses and comments. She misses the opportunity to contemplate more profoundly on the image that has formed in her mind. It could be stated that Anna, as the experiencing self, might have

reached the conclusion that Kel is her sibling, however an insight gained by her only after Kel's death. Such understanding would have changed the course of her actions and represented a key moment in the protagonist's development. Therefore, the epiphanic moment in which Anna realizes that Kel is her sibling continues to haunt her as she narrates the story, the frequent memories of which only aggravate her suffering ("over and over"). The author skillfully makes use of dissonant self-narration to further underline the significance of the secret bond between the protagonists. Kilroy does this so cleverly in the following excerpt in which Kel enquires about her whereabouts and she responds: "I didn't understand what he meant by that. I understand now, but now is a lifetime away, and now doesn't count. Now is only there to let me remember then. He'll always be a knife in my back." (Kilroy, *All Summer* 96). Dissonant self-narration exposes her sorrow, remorse and longing after her late twin brother.

Relatively early in the novel, dissonant self-narration causes the effect of foreshadowing by including Anna's thoughts on her first encounter with Kel: "Kel's touch wasn't like any other touch. Maybe his fingertips had been burned off with acid. Maybe he had no lines on his hand at all. Maybe I am trying to absolve myself by demonising him. The things I say to justify how I felt about him. There are no ways of justifying how I felt about him" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 64). From Anna's call for absolution, readers may infer that somehow Kel is her victim, even though the crime remains unknown. At this point, the narrating self is trying to cope with the sense of guilt by portraying Kel as wicked, which is the practice she repeats throughout the story. Henceforth, any derogatory depictions of Kel can be attributed to Anna's attempts to deal with her feeling of remorse and, as a consequence, has become susceptible to keen observation.

Dorrit Cohn states that the self-narrated monologue as a form in which the weightiest questions are asked by the narrator (*Transparent Minds* 167). Anna as the narrator-protagonist relives some emotional moments, such as the following one: "A conservator! I bellowed. What in the name of fuck is a conservator? [...] Why else would you have followed me around all summer? Why else would you have kept me safe all this time in your home? It was the painting you wanted. And me like an idiot thinking it was because" (Kilroy, *All Summer* 200). These emphatically charged questions bewilder Anna, which is which is effectfully conveyed by the use of the self-narrated monologue. The effect would have been lost and the key moment missed out, if the whole scene had been narrated by the use of a different device. The questions she is asking (including the one referring to the title of the novel in it) eventually result in Anna's disappointment and state of

despair. The monologue comes to an end abruptly, and the audience is left without the narrator's explanation of the reasons for his actions. Nevertheless, one can assume that Anna thinks he took care of her because he had feelings for her, though she realizes that the feelings of affection have merely been a pretense at affection, she becomes overwhelmed by shock and grief.

4. Narratological Analysis of *The Devil I Know*

4.1 Unreliability

The main protagonists of *All Summer* and *The Devil I Know* are both homodiegetic and overt narrators who, at some point in the novel, openly admit that they are fallible tellers. The statements exposing "verbal habits", naivety, and false convictions of the narrators provide evidence of their lack of credulity.

In Kilroy's latest novel, there are clues that Tristram St. Lawrence, the male narrator-protagonist, misleads the reader by means of his gullibility, limited rhetorical privilege, false convictions, and isolation in narration. First, he fails to comprehend the wicked nature of his shady associate, M. Deauville, which is evident in the description of their mutual relationship in the initial stages of Tristram's recovery from alcohol addiction: "When I felt I couldn't cope a second longer and had reached for the hotel phone to dial room service to order up a drink, on cue, my mobile would ring. It was as if he could read my mind. It takes one to know one, I suppose" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 87). Tristram mistakes M. Deauville for an (ex) alcoholic, his "mind reading" techniques and peculiar phone interventions for genuine understanding of the cravings and urges of a recovering alcoholic. The second indication of Tristram's naivety underscores the intentions of the evil incarnate more precisely: "I [Tristram] bared my soul to the man [...]. He appeared genuinely concerned for its fate [...]. He accepted the sorry state of it and did not condemn me, but instead listened patiently as I droned on. I owed him my life. It was as simple as that" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 87). In Goethe's play *Faust*, the character of the Devil (Mephistopheles) is attracted by the soul of Faust, an intellectual figure, and seeks to make a pact in order to obtain it. Similar to the play, in *The Devil I Know* there is an analogy to the signing of such a deal with the Devil, when Tristram welcomes M. Deauville's minions (the barrister and assistant) to his castle in order to sign and confirm the acquisition of properties. McGlynn points to the parallel between the acquisition in Kilroy's novel

and the motif of alchemy in *Faust* (48). Before writing his signature and while holding the fountain pen the barrister has proffered, Tristram flippantly questions how to make use of it to which the barrister replies: ““This pen has adapted to many hands over the centuries”” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 265), implying that this practice of signing contracts has a long tradition. Soon after divulging this odd episode, Fergus asks Tristram if he finds any peculiarities pertaining to the agreement and Tristram retorts: “No, Fergus, not in the least. It is what my family has done for centuries, I suppose” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 266). It appears that Tristram’s general credulity, his lack of conviction and of critical approach to the actions performed or delegated by M. Deauville certainly underline his unreliability, if not culpability.

The previous instance is based on the principles of magical realism, which is a combination of “realism and the fantastic so that the marvelous seems to grow organically withing the ordinary, blurring the distinction between them” (Faris 1). There are similar episodes in the novel as well. Tristram remains falsely convinced that M. Deauville represents a chief business figure who is “seated at his control panel watching his monitors, firing off instructions from his executive chair. That is how I pictured M. Deauville. A face illuminated blue by a bank of computer screens” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 23). The male narrator-protagonist repeatedly alludes to M. Deauville’s sedentary position by the use of alliteration and onomatopoeic words, such as “[t]ocka tocka. M. Deauville’s fleet fingers flying across the keyboard. The man could type as quickly as he could think” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 98-99). As the story nears its end, the reader finally discovers the truth about this sinister mastermind – when Tristram first notices the hooves and their clatter on Larney. He is a family servant, and he dances in front of Tristram, who realizes the real origin of the familiar sound: “*Tocka tocka, tocka tocka*. Not fingertips flying across a keyboard but the sound of hooves” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 334). This instance of the bizarre counterfactual utterly negates Tristram’s former belief in M. Deauville and exposes his false conviction about this evil embodiment. Therefore, it contributes to the suspicion that the narrating agent is an unreliable narrator with a limited rhetorical privilege.

Further indications of the infallibility concern Tristram’s narrative which permeates the novel, even though the presence of at least two other dispositions are mentioned when Fergus, the chief attorney, interrogates him: ““This is the same barbeque mentioned in both Mr McGee’s and Mr Hickey’s testimonies at which the proposal to purchase the farm in north County Dublin was also mooted, is that correct?”” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 221). In spite of some matching details in all three

sworn statements, Tristram can be regarded as an isolated narrator (and not supported or corrected one) because the reader is not certain, if Tristram's account conflicts fully or partially with the testimonies of the other two known narrators (Hickey and McGee). In that respect, there is a moment when the male protagonist refuses to comply with the chief attorney's request to elaborate on a violent past event. Tristram straightforwardly admits having been present at the time of the purported incident involving his partner and the Viking: "I turned to the men. Hickey had Viking up against the wall. Yes, that is when the alleged assault on Mr Dowdall took place, although there was insufficient evidence to prosecute. Me? No, sorry, can't help you there, Fergus. I didn't see a thing" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 303). However, despite his outward honesty, Tristram does not divulge information related to this particular event. To fully comprehend the meaning and the consequence of this rebuttal, it may be fruitful to return to the moments when Tristram discreetly voices his opinion about the Viking shortly after their first meeting: "'What a cock,' Hickey remarked and I nodded. For once, we agreed on something" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 57). Since this is not a single instance when Tristram expresses enmity with the Viking, it may be suspected that he is not willing to provide evidence that might benefit the so called "whoremonger" (204). Therefore, being an isolated and emotionally involved narrator, the male protagonist is more fallible and prone to scrutiny from the reader.

Another evidence of Tristram's unreliability is presented when the narrator-protagonist openly declares that he can be suspected of partially credible narration. When asked about the details pertaining to Monsieur Deauville, he responds: "[h]is nationality? Again, this is something of a grey area. There are no white areas in my tale" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 88). The impression evoked in the reader is that his story is replete with inaccurate information or narrative gaps undermines the narrator-protagonist's truthfulness.

Moments after Tristram succumbs to his desire for alcohol and drinks the contents of Hickey's flask, he bluntly states the following: "I cannot guarantee that I managed to get the words out although I know that I certainly tried. You'll have to ask Hickey for confirmation. You'll have to ask him for confirmation on a lot of things from here on in" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 298). The narration switches from the experiencing self to the narrating agent in order to direct the attention to the teller, his audience, and the importance of his declaration. Apparently, Tristram, as the narrator, becomes aware that his fear of relapsing into drinking, the trauma, and the subsequent episodes of the regained habit start to affect his memory-dependent account, and thus his trustworthiness. He

addresses and warns the commission and the reader against believing his tale. Henceforth, his narration could be considered fallible or even implausible without the comparison with Hickey's statements about the underlying facts and events. By allowing Hickey's testimony to lend strength to his own account, Tristram alerts the reader to his admitted lack of reliability and the veracity of his deposition.

Arguably, the strongest case against a narrator's reliability is that of questioning their perception, comprehension, or mental condition, the instances of which appear in the novel and apply to all the narrator-protagonist's statements, beliefs, and convictions. As Tristram approaches the avenue leading to the entrance of his castle, he starts to perceive various shapes, such as "cut-throats, hanged corpses, ghouls. I am a troubled man. I have a troubled mind. I see things in the dark (Kilroy, *The Devil* 30). A possible reason behind the repeated instances of hallucinations might be his evident lack of sleep as he complains of insomnia: "It had been my worst night yet. I had not even managed one of my two-hour cycles" (160), followed by "[m]aybe I was going insane" (162). Due to Tristram's multiple accounts that include incredible and supernatural elements, Fergus demands to know: "'Mr St Lawrence, during this period, would you describe your mental state as delusional?'" (339) to which he answers affirmatively. The authority of the narrator-protagonist is undermined by the frequent references to the psychological trauma that influences the truthfulness of his storytelling.

4.2 Narrative Situation

Relationship / Level (<i>The Devil I Know</i>)	First Level	Second Level
Homo- / intradiegetic (first-person narrative)	Tristram St Lawrence, the first-person narrator, testifies as an eyewitness in court and is cross-examined by the chief attorney Fergus O'Reilly Desmond Hickey and McGee give evidence to Justice O'Reilly before the tribunal	Tristram's and Hickey's fraudulent attempt in property business, aided by Monsieur Deauville, Ray Lawless, and the members of Golden Circle Tristram explores various localities driven by Desmond Hickey, attends

	Tristram narrates his return to the Claremont site and the castle to the unknown narratee / the reader	parties and bars in his company The male protagonist discloses details concerning private family matters, recovery from alcohol addiction and relapse into alcoholism, AA meetings, as well as his intimate affair with Edel Hickey Tristram encounters various manifestations of the Devil, his minions, and proxies (Larney, the Oldcastle creature, the barrister, and the motorcyclist)
--	--	--

Table 2: Relationship between the narrators and the narrative levels (*The Devil I Know*)

As far as the narrators are concerned, the narrative situation in *The Devil I Know* is less complex than in *All Summer* (Table 2). Regardless of the hierarchy of the discourse levels, the narrators remain inside the story world they relate. At the first level of narration, the first-person protagonist and the homodiegetic narrator produce a narrative by retrieving information from memory. The narration is ulterior as the events investigated occurred approximately ten years previously. The narrator is interrogated by Fergus, his close friend and attorney at law, whom Tristram repeatedly interrupts and addresses directly by first name. At the same diegetic level, there are at least two more testimonies, Desmond Hickey's and McGee's (Kilroy, *The Devil* 221). Even though, the content of these depositions is omitted, the reader becomes aware that Tristram's account is not the first in a row, which might be a sign of limited importance of his account and his role in the entire investigation. Throughout the novel, it is evident that the previous accounts have the same narratee (Fergus and the Commission), however this context cannot be claimed for the tale that marks the ending. On the tenth and final day of the investigation, Tristram leaves the courtroom:

It was a dry, brisk, bright afternoon when I finished giving my evidence. [...] The stage hook appeared to haul me off. A clerk led me out and a cavity opened within. I was yesterday's man. I did not immediately leave the court building but instead sat brooding on the headmaster's bench in the public area. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 353)

At this point in the story, the reader becomes aware of the shift in the narratee – from the attorney at court to an unknown person as Tristram is no longer physically present in the courtroom. In spite of that, the register and intimacy of address are maintained: “I [Tristram] caught a northbound train. In case you haven’t already rumbled me, I am unable to drive. I’ve gotten through my whole life making that admission to no one. I may as well get everything off my chest while I’m on a roll” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 354). This passage supports the evidence of the shift in the narratee. The newly addressed individual may be the reader since the narrator-protagonist, as the sole narrating agent, has the freedom to transpose the narration at the diegetic level. To support this claim, there is an instance when even the narrator-protagonist admits having no audience: “Why am I still banging on about her [Edel]? No one is listening any more?” (357). It may be implied that by “no one” Tristram means the tribunal, as, at this point in the story, the courtroom is no longer his place of narration.

At the second level of narration, the intradiegetic narrator is the central figure whose endeavors are recounted to the reader. As Farner points out, the narrator’s past self acts as a participant at the lower level, which marks the initial stage in the character-protagonist’s development. Therefore, numerous intruding comments by the older and wiser narrator from the diegetic level are interspersed in the embedded narrative as he reflects on the actions taken. Moreover, the functions of the subordinate narrative level are worth being analyzed. First, the explicative function provides an explanation and purpose of the second-degree narrative. Tristram’s entire second-degree narrative represents a testimony rendered in dialogue during a cross examination at trial. As such, this lengthy episode serves explicative purposes of the hypodiegetic narrative – it provides evidence and showcases cooperation in the investigation of the entire investment scam and the people involved. According to the court practice and based on the evidence given, the Commission will reach a verdict, which leads us to the thematic function of the narrator’s testimony.

As delineated in the chapter on narrative situation, thematic function points to the analogic or contrastive relationship of the two narratives. As the story starts to unfold, Tristram does not hide his intention to be straightforward and truthful about his immoral deeds in the past “[p]eople have been saying a lot of bad things about me in the press. I am here to say a few more” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 5), and when the end of the novel approaches, he declares “[t]his may come as a surprise to those assembled in this chamber but I am a dreadful liar” (271). It appears that the Tristram with a history of misdeeds from the past has somehow become a morally improved person with an honest

and sincere interest, who uncovers the truth about his past wrongdoings. This element might add to the classification of the novel as a Bildungsroman. The presence of the thematic relation of contrast between the frame narrative and the hyponarrative is signaled by the stark change in the narrator-protagonist's behavior (from corrupt to moral). On the other hand, the following passage underscores the similarity between the first- and second-degree narrative. When asked to describe his relationship with Monsieur Deauville, Tristram realizes the analogy that has existed for a while: "I did all the talking and he [Monsieur Deauville] did all the listening – pretty much the same set-up as here, I've just noticed. What does that say about me? Nothing positive" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 81). This perception explains the main issues of the frame narrative within the embedded narrative. Tristram is tremendously grateful to Monsieur Deauville for his patience in listening (87), the effect of which seems beneficial to his mental health. According to the analogic relation between the narratives, it might be concluded that Tristram's testimony in court (frame narrative) resembles, to a degree, a therapeutic process.

4.3 Narrative Time

4.3.1 Sequence

The second-degree narrative, recounted by Tristram St. Lawrence as the narrating self, is narrated before an audience at a law-court in a time span of ten days. As a witness, he delivers the narrative in which events occur in a chronological order as this form of narration mirrors the practice of giving evidence in court. Regardless of the occasional instances of digressions, analepses, and prolepses, the narrative follows a continuous and logical sequence, which can be observed in the depiction of the impression Edel, an archetype of the Irish conwoman, leaves on Tristram. There are a few key moments in the sequential arrangement of the events that express the narrator-protagonist's initial attraction and final repugnance.

At Hickey's ranch, Edel approaches Tristram and shows concern for his swollen hand (Kilroy, *The Devil* 217). During the intimate conversation, she complains about being scared, alone, and unprotected at nights (the damsel-in-distress trope). Moreover, Tristram senses "a delicate connection" (219) between them when Edel comments on the sea's surface: "She turned to me and I stared at her in amazement, a look she would later describe as one of withering scorn. That's

exactly what I was thinking! I wanted to tell her, and I struggled to formulate that response” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 218). The sentence rendered in consonant narration may be interpreted as a sign of a potential soulmate bonding. Sometime later, on the day after the successful bid for the Pudong site, Tristram takes a stroll in the gardens near his castle and meets Edel again. Despite the affair that ensues from this encounter, the narrator repeatedly expresses his doubts, if this encounter has been accidental (243).

Tristram’s numerous attempts at initiating a conversation about Edel with Hickey prove to be fruitless. However, after the investment failure, the builder starts to reveal intimate and incriminating information about her:

‘A course. An here, remember the gummy owl pony we found in the garden? The one what could barely walk? It’s Edel’s. From when she was a kid. Isn’t that mad?’
‘I don’t believe you. Edel would never neglect a defenceless animal like that.’
Hickey pursed his lips. ‘I’d put nothing past that woman. Biggest mistake a me life, leaving me first wife for her. Poor Bernie. Heart a gold.’ [sic] (Kilroy, *The Devil* 315)

The sequential play sheds light on the event previously unrelated to the character of Edel and introduces a different perspective. By the use of character focalization, the experiencing self and the reader become aware of the previously unknown character’s traits. However, an epiphanic moment initiates Tristram’s marked shift in his attitude towards the conwoman. As Tristram enters the atrium at Hickey’s improvised ranch, he notices his grandparents’ chandelier and accuses Hickey of being a thief (Kilroy, *The Devil* 212). Conversely, after having been rejected by Edel at her doorstep, Tristram starts reflecting on the person who might have the keen interest in owning the chandelier:

The last thing I saw was the chandelier that Hickey had stolen from Hilltop. But why would Hickey want my chandelier? A chandelier was just a big light bulb to a man like him. It was her. She had spotted it. It had caught her eye, so she had instructed him to take it down. *Strip the place of valuables while you still have a chance*. ‘Keep it,’ I said to the shut door. ‘Keep the chandelier. It’s made of glass, just like you.’ [...] A woman as hard as her, a woman as brittle as her, a woman made of glass. I could see that now. I could see right through her now. Transparent as glass. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 331)

In this passage, the reader is presented with the experiencing self’s train of thought which exposes how Tristram’s infers who the real culprit is. He considers two distinct motivations for committing the theft of the family heirloom and contrasts these two opposing perspectives in a sequential

ordering. The use of alliteration and quoted-interior monologue (words in italics), as Edel's instruction resurfaces in his mind, highlight the process of deduction and the devastating effect of realizing the truth. Henceforth, Edel's lines are referred to having some negative connotations, when the feelings of disappointment and regret are evoked: "[t]he ones who were never childlike are the ones you have to watch out for. The ones who have mastered their emotional impulses. The ones who are cold. *Strip the place of valuables while you still have a chance*" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 345). Her role resembles a literary stock character of a temptress, similar to the devil, which makes Tristram, less culpable for his wrongdoings due to his failed attempt to resist the temptation, (McGlynn 50).

4.3.2 Summary

In *The Devil I Know*, as well as Claire Kilroy's first novel *All Summer*, summaries are used sparingly. However, the crucial difference is that, in the former, the narrator, who is simultaneously the main protagonist, acts as an eyewitness at trial who recalls the information about events from the past. This situation presupposes that his accounts depend on, and are susceptible to, leading questions. If we assume that the events recorded in the novel are realistic - though intertwined with instances of 'magic realism', it can be stated that, by law, witnesses need to provide a 'witness summary' only if they are unwilling or unable to testify voluntarily in a court of law⁸, whereas witnesses in court need not spare any details pertaining to the investigation. It is obvious that Tristram St. Lawrence is present at trial and gives oral evidence apparently willingly – "People have been saying a lot of bad things about me in the press. I am here to say a few more" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 5) and "[...] had I spent the rest of my life on the international conference circuit, I would not be before you giving evidence today" (6). The chief attorney Fergus interrogates Tristram, who gives a rather lengthy and elaborate testimony, which is not a condensed narrative and does not lack in detail. Nevertheless, apart from a few summarized phone conversations between Tristram and Monsieur Deauville (202) and Hickey and Ray Lawless (247), most instances of this literary device are provided by characters and relate to the male narrator-protagonist. Such as in the following summary that concerns Tristram's parents:

⁸ *Civil Rules & Practice Directions: Part 32 - Evidence*. Ministry of Justice. 2017. 27. Apr. 2020. <<https://www.justice.gov.uk/courts/procedure-rules/civil/rules/part32>>.

Hickey maintained a taxi-driver patter for the duration of the journey through the early evening traffic. Howaya getting on abroad, Tristram? You keeping well? An your da? How's your da? Desperate business about your ma, poor woman. Ah, we were all very sorry down the town to see her go. She was well liked, so she was. Thought we might see you at the funeral but they said you were too busy ...? Then a course we all heard you were dead. Must be some job to keep you away from your ma's funeral ...? I heard you were high up in the world of international finance ...? At this I turned my head. [sic] (Kilroy, *The Devil* 16)

In this passage, rendered in a quoted dialogue, a couple of years in the life of Tristram are condensed, and the reader learns about the events from Tristram's past, his occupation, and the strained relationship with his parents. The characterization is employed indirectly by the clever use of summary, which proves essential for the further reading experience.

The very last few pages of the novel present the conversation between the male narrator-protagonist and the "local historian", who turns out to be another devil's minion. This peculiar figure summarizes the events leading to Tristram's nemesis or downfall. Speaking about the last earl in the line of the St. Lawrence family, the local historian begins the conversation with an unprejudiced history lesson, however his account assumes a more biased and sinister tone:

'The benighted fool had squandered everything, you see. Every last farthing and more besides. What past generations had laboured to create, destroyed just like that.' [...] 'A whole way of life gone. He racked up a debt that can never be settled. [...]' 'He had notions, the young master. Thought he could make millions overnight. But that's the problem with setting yourself up as a little god. You invite the other fella in. Don't you?' (Kilroy, *The Devil* 359)

As the summary unfolds, the talk about a neutral third person slowly transitions into accusatory and menacing comments directed at the narrator-protagonist. This instance of a condensed narrative at the end of the novel gives support to the final retribution and engages the reader in witnessing the act of incrimination.

4.3.3 Descriptions of Scenes

The chapter on narrative duration in works of literature explains that the use of dialogue is linked to the mode of scenic or dramatic presentation. Therefore, it may be safe to assume that the entire frame narrative is rendered in a conversational form either between the male narrator-protagonist and the attorney, or between the narrator and the unknown narratee, who remains silent in the

ending phase. On the other hand, the exchange of dialogue is narrated or quoted by the narrator-protagonist. There are rare instances when the combination of both means of conversation are employed:

M. Deauville's proposal necessitated that I live in Ireland. Domiciled, was the word he used. Was I willing to remain domiciled in the Republic of Ireland? he enquired, explaining that a position had come up in a company that was seeking to open an office in a low-taxation jurisdiction with benevolent regulation policies. I looked at my hatchet. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 47)

The narrator-protagonist quotes the direct question of his sponsor verbatim and narrates the rest of the dialogue to the reader via indirect speech. His style of narration evidently adopts the idiolect of Monsieur Deauville. This mode of rendering thought efficiently highlights the sponsor's authority, his sophisticated eloquence when presenting the attractive offer, and thus, evokes sympathy in the reader for the narrator-protagonist who is lured by the promise of a stable financial gain. The exposing of characters' traits is not only achieved by the use of dialogue, but also in a more straightforward method of characterization. Since Tristram does not own a driver's license, Hickey does all the driving for him, taking him to the places they visited together. On one such occasion when they returned to the castle, Hickey comments:

'I won't come in for the cup a tea cause I'm up me teeth, but I appreciate the offer, so I do. You're a gent. I always said that about you. Always stood up for you, no matter what they accused you of. Mental psychopathic things. Dodgy satanic shit. Ah, not at all, I'd say: you have him all wrong. Bit up his own hole, I grant you that, but he wouldn't hurt a fly. An as for his lovely manners! His dead mammy would be proud.' (Kilroy, *The Devil* 58)

The beginning and the ending of the passage bear a sarcastic tone as Tristram does not offer the invitation for a drink. Since Hickey's comments are driven by the lack of hospitality from the narrator-protagonist's side, the reader is uncertain of their veracity, especially of the statements in which he defends the allegations about Tristram. In that sense, the reader is aware that Hickey may be pretending to be Tristram's friend, who pleads for sympathy. On the other hand, since the dialogue is quoted and not narrated, the reader receives unrecycled information about how peculiar and unorthodox the male narrator-protagonist is, which contributes to his direct characterization. This passage of text, rendered in dialogue, serves a double function as it provides the reader with useful descriptions of both protagonists.

4.3.4 Pause

In *The Devil I Know*, descriptive pauses are frequently used devices for expressing the protagonist's frame of mind and socio-political criticism through irony, hyperbole, and sarcasm. The following passage about the corrupt minister exemplifies these applications:

I half-expected a third arm to extend from Ray's belted midriff to snatch the package, his little parasitic bag man. You have seen the television footage. The Minister wasn't fat so much as misshapen. And he was misshapen because he grabbed and grabbed, a country spilling over its borders, annexing smaller states, distending with each acquisition. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 112).

Tristram describes Ray Lawless fancifully, addresses the attorney and the tribunal, and conveys his opinion on the greedy politics of the country and the people in power in this regard. Another remark directed at investors refers to the trend in Irish economy at the time: "[a]nd the punters would believe it because they wanted it to be true, and lately in this country, wanting something to be true made it true. Wanting something to be worth a hundred million made it worth a hundred million" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 248). The action time of the story comes to a halt as Tristram narrates his disapproval of the speculative business. These are all ways of slowing the time of action and diverting attention to the discourse and the narrator himself by the use of narrative pause.

4.3.5 Frequency

Frequency in narratives is understood to be the relation between the story event and its narrated form, established with regards to repetition. In *The Devil I Know*, repetitive incidents or by definition *repeated events* convey symbolical meaning, as it is the case with the situations dealing with the consumption of milk. Interestingly, there is a lack of descriptions of this drink in its natural form, but milk is referred to rather as hydrogenated (7), curdled (267, 274, 312), or sour (182, 312). According to the semantic range of the word, milk is associated with innocence, whiteness, paradise, and maternal connotations (Ferber 126). In the novel, the images of the defiled or processed state of milk imply corruption, moral degradation, and culpability of the characters. The repetitive descriptions of impure milk function as a reminder of the protagonists' sins and straying

from moral values. Having realized that the investment business failed completely, Hickey symbolically abandons the righteous path: “[h]e added milk and curdled floaters rose to the top. The milk was still sour. ‘Ah dear,’ he said with unexpected stoicism, then opened the window and horsed the carton out” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 312).

Second, the leitmotif of death in its various manifestations is ubiquitous in the story, and its recurrence prompts the topic of mortality and transience of human life, which is evident in the phone conversation between Tristram and his mother:

‘Tristram,’ she gasped, ‘the Guards told me you were *dead!*’ I had not heard her voice in years. Too ashamed to call or show my face. ‘It’s okay, Mummy, I’m still *alive!*’ I was crying. So was she. I promised to come home but the connection *went dead* and my pledges *vanished into the ether*. I later discovered that she *passed away* the following day. It was probably for the best that I did not know this at the time. The news would *have finished* me. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 87; emphasis added)

The break in communication between Tristram and his mother attributed to the rumor of his (clinical) death. Hence, various characters who meet Tristram express their disbelief straightforwardly, to which Tristram always responds with the same sentence – “[t]hat was another Tristram St Lawrence” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 13, 20, 30, 139, 201, 318, 348, 359). The motif of death is also addressed by the representative form of a shadow (Ferber 54): “[i]t [the crane] swung its head towards us like a lunatic in a restraining chair and the shadow of the boom came galloping across the poached ground. I shuddered when the shadow swept over me” (165). Later, when Tristram ponders about meeting Monsieur Deauville, the image of the same event resurfaces in his mind: “[t]he shadow of the boom swung over my grave again and I shuddered” (184), and once more “[t]he shadow of the boom swung over my grave again and I shuddered, though it was night and there weren’t supposed to be shadows” (204). Furthermore, the idea of death is not only evoked in the male protagonist’s mind, but there are also visible in tactile signs, for instance, Tristram’s pale complexion (Ferber 54):

‘You’re very pale, Tristram. That’s another thing everyone keeps saying about you. They say: he’s very pale, isn’t he? Hasn’t he gone very pale? He wasn’t that pale, sure he wasn’t? Death warmed up. That’s what they call you behind your back. Did ya know that? Death warmed up. Something funny there. Jaysus, it’s fucken freezing in here.’ [sic] (Kilroy, *The Devil* 288)

In this dialogue, the narrator is repeatedly focalized by the character(s) in the story as Hickey mentions the gossip, which is an instance of iterative narration. In other words, the event mentioned

once here seems to have happened numerous times before. This passage ends with another sentient indication of the presence of symptoms of death, which are perishing temperatures in Hickey's truck and Tristram's freezing hands. Meeting people and shaking hands are frequently accompanied by the same reaction and the almost verbatim exclamation of the phrase: "your hands are freezing" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 14, 19, 31, 141, 216, 324, 346, 348). The repetitive action of squeezing Tristram's hands affects the reader's representation of the male protagonist in combination with character focalization. Conversely, Tristram's (clinical) death can be regarded in positive terms as it symbolically represents "the supreme liberation" and "the resurrection of matter" (Cirlot 78). After Tristram has relapsed into the drinking-habit and regressed to the previous way of life, the voice of the experiencing self explains: "I had woken to terrible sights in the past. Terrible, terrible. Can't bear to think of them. That was another Tristram St Lawrence. I could never go back there. And yet I just had" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 301).

4.4 Focalization

Various submodes of narrative perception are delineated in the chapter on focalization. Different criteria allow branching out into smaller subtypes of the complex concept of focalization, depending on the limitations, focal points, and the object of focalization. In *The Devil I Know*, the narrator of the embedded narrative finds himself in the courtroom, sits before the tribunal, and is interrogated by the attorney. In the following passage, Tristram directly speaks to his audience:

Suddenly, you're all looking grossly uncomfortable. Relax, I won't divulge his name. Besides, I didn't know his name until I was summoned to this Commission and came face to face with him again all these years later. Everyone simply called him the Hunger [...]. What? Don't tell me you didn't know he was working for the other team, too? (Kilroy, *The Devil* 215)

In this explanation, Tristram, as the narrator-focalizer, asserts narrative dominance by the means of direct address. According to Nieragden's classification, it can be stated that the vision in the first-degree narrative is rendered via heterodiegetic narratorial focalization as it appears that Tristram is the sole narrator because no other characters present their view of the events directly to the reader. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that the court practice is followed and, therefore, the dialogue between Tristram and Fergus is put down in writing or some other form, which is apparent

in their multiple references to the word “record”. Tristram reveals certain details about his relationship with other characters, while cautiously mentioning that this information is specifically “for the record” (5, 18, 108, 342, 348). Moreover, the presence of a person focalizing Tristram in the courtroom is confirmed twice in the novel by the use of graphically different statements whose formal register appears to correspond to court proceedings: “[A *sheaf of documents is passed to the witness*]” (229) and “[*Witness unbuttons his shirt to reveal a small oval scar*]” (320). These bracketed sentences in italics bear resemblance to the lines from a drama, and thus, allude to the stage setting and add to the dramatic experience of reading. Nevertheless, they are represented via the external focalization model as they describe the witness’s appearance at the expense of his inner thoughts or feelings. This attributes to the established position of the narrator as the focalized object from without in the first-degree narrative (Rimmon-Kenan). For these brief moments, it might be claimed that the focalization approximates to its zero focal point or the omniscient mode of narration in a singularly first-person narrative.

On the other hand, at the second level of narration, the character of Tristram is the vehicle of retrospective focalization and perceives the surroundings, individuals in his vicinity both externally and internally. Tristram meticulously observes Hickey, his partner, in the following instance of heterodiegetic narratorial focalization (Nieragden):

I looked down to smile a small smile before facing Hickey once more. I inspected him in silence. [...] Hickey’s shirt had turned semi-translucent in the rain. The thin cotton fabric did not cling to his skin the way my shirt clung to mine but was instead draped over his matted black whorls of chest hair like a picnic blanket spread over tussocks of grass. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 53)

The object is focalized externally by the narrator-protagonist who makes far-fetched comparisons or conceits. The teller regularly engages in these exaggerated descriptions that are pregnant with ironical or sarcastic remarks. The same principle is applied to a different focalized object (the corrupted minister):

A rain-coloured man is how I would describe him. Rain has no colour and nor did he. A rain-coloured man with a rain-coloured hair and rain-tinted glasses on his nose. There was an excess of trench coat about his person, not in girth but height, as if there were two of the in there, one standing on the other’s shoulders. [...] He smelled wrong, because yes, I could smell him when he drew up before us. It was the odour of a garment left too long at the back of the wardrobe – mouldy, mildewy, mothballed. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 109-110)

The narrator's disgust at Ray Lawless is intensified by the use of literary figures of conceit, irony, and alliteration. The language is rendered in a poetic style through external focalization. However, there are similar passages of a deplorable content in which characters are depicted. In the following description of Svetlana, the Viking's call girl, there is a sudden shift from external to internal focalization – "Svetlana's nails were an inch long. Her palms were stained fake-tan orange, her lifelines and heart lines a tracery of tobacco brown. Your path in life will be a dirty one, a palmist would have told her. You will have a filthy, dirty, little path" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 200). The narrator observes the focalized object whose pessimistic thoughts are momentarily revealed by the use of internal focalization. Svetlana broods over an event from her past and remembers the prediction from the palm reader in exact wording via direct speech. Tristram also focalizes Hickey whose thoughts are evoked in the form of a quoted monologue "[t]he meeting had left him in a philosophical mood. They liked us. They liked us guys. We had *balls*. Their [the Golden Circle's] validation had filled Hickey with a desire to soliloquise, to survey the great leap [...]" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 141). Hickey's ideas are unveiled to the reader with no open quotations that would otherwise signal a change in focalization and would "mark off dialogue from the surrounding discourse and contribute to the framing of the dialogue" (Bronwen 20). In other words, this instantaneous leap into the consciousness of a character is not marked by any narrator's tags. Ferguson keenly observes how Kilroy criticizes hypermasculinity in the novel and states that "Hickey's endorsement of the speculating business equates male genitalia with force" (69).

By juxtaposing the external and internal focalization modes of narration, the narrator skillfully contrasts the character's inner thoughts and outward expressions. This strategy effectively indicates the discrepancy between the characters' thoughts and actions, thus revealing hypocrisy and dishonesty as two dominant motives in the novel. Tristram openly admits to Hickey that he doesn't know the position of Hilltop boundaries, and the immediate reaction ensues: "[h]e [Hickey] was delighted with that. You could see him regaling the lads with it down the Cock. *He never found the boundaries!* 'Yeah', he nodded, scratching his armpit, 'we had that problem with the back gardens in Grace-O too'" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 45). Hickey's initial response was the facial expression from which Tristram could perceive joy via external focalization. Then focalization is transposed inward, and the reader witnesses an image forming in Hickey's mind – making fun of Tristram before an audience in a bar (words in italics). The builder appears to be sincere in his attempt to show understanding and compassion for Tristram's lack of knowledge and inexperience by pointing out

that such problems are common, however his inner plans and mockery are exposed by the use of this literary device.

The same technique is used for another deceitful character – “[t]he Viking clocked Hickey’s approaching truck and nodded a greeting, or not so much a greeting as an acknowledgement: I see you, I know that you are there. Then he returned his attention to the phone. Hickey and his passenger were of little interest to him” (57). External focalization illuminates the correlation between the fake regard and indifference that is evident in the Viking’s demeanor despite his initial greeting. Tristram refers to himself as Hickey’s passenger, which is an obvious signal of the shift in the focalized despite the lack of punctuation. Via focalization from within, the reader can access the Viking’s mind and witness his thoughts. The narrator engages in the same mode of perception to zoom in the Viking’s sense of moral depravity and attitude towards raising children when he shows up on launch day:

‘Leave that tree alone, Roman,’ he called as the boy struggled to wrench a young Japanese maple out of the ground, but there was no conviction in the Viking’s voice. Pull it if you wish, Roman, he was saying. Do what feels good. Do what feels right. Nobody is going to stop you, son, that’s a valuable lesson in life. The maple snapped. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 197)

The Viking’s initial command is in stark contrast to the actual idea of going through life devoid of any sense of responsibility, which can be observed in the sequence of orders rendered in direct speech and introduced with no punctuation marks. Internal focalization applied in the passage above provides evidence to the deceitful and greedy nature of the Viking’s personality.

There are also a couple of moments in the novel that resemble cinematic movements of the film camera – the objective of external focalization settles on the final target after briefly focusing on the previously focalized objects. This is evident in the dual perception of Ray Lawless and his object of interest “[w]e [Tristram and Hickey] sat in silence studying Ray as Ray sat in silence studying the plans” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 111), or when the Viking calls Svetlana to join Tristram and Hickey “I [Tristram] noted Hickey noting this – the Viking’s hand command” (199). This play with focalization and its quick shift of focus is accompanied by the use of alliteration to enhance the experience of the narrator’s eye movement, which may signal an awkward situation, the narrator’s nervous state, or his keen eye. The meaning is profound and foreshadowing in the following instance of fleeting focalization – “[a]nother door swung open into the atrium and Hickey bulldozed in, catching me staring at his wife, and his wife staring at my property from his ceiling” (212). This

moment is pregnant with subconscious desire and motivations that drive the protagonists to their object of perception. In other words, at this point in the story, Hickey needs the loan from Castle Holdings, Tristram's bank, whereas Edel authorized the theft of the chandelier from Hilltop. The third element in this triangular relationship is Tristram, who seems genuinely infatuated and not driven by material gain, unlike the Hickey couple.

As far as the principles of many-sided or multiple focalization are concerned, it seems that they do not apply in the novel as there are no instances in which events are perceived by at least two narrators. Contrary to the perception from the narrator's side, the male protagonist also lends focalization to other characters who cast their eyes at inanimate objects around them or perceive the narrator more meticulously. On one occasion, when Desmond Hickey arrives to pick up Tristram in front of his castle, the builder summarizes the poor state of the residence, as Tristram reports:

Hickey had already cased the joint in the time it took me to get down to him. 'Gutters need replacing,' he pointed out. 'Chimney's bollixed. Rotten windows. State a them slanty walls. An here, have you seen this?' The cracks under the sills. 'Subsidence.' He sucked air through his teeth. 'You're talking big money there, big money.' [sic] (Kilroy, *The Devil* 41)

Character focalization appears to be an indispensable mode of perception when presenting the reader with the dilapidated condition of the building because, otherwise, it would have been overlooked. With no means of maintenance, residential conversion appears to be improbable. The image of its neglected state presents a personification of a dysfunctional family. Tristram's immigration from Ireland, alcoholism, and his lack of care for his parents attributed to the troubled and strained relationship between him and the father, who seems to blame Tristram for the death of his mother and seeks an apology (33). In a similar manner, another character is a vehicle of external focalization, however this time the focalized object is the narrator himself: "[s]he [Edel] took in the cut of me: the dirty clothes, the unshaven chin, the bloodshot eyes. And the smell" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 329). Shortly after learning about his father's death, Tristram's vague plan of elopement fails entirely even before proposing it. Edel is disgusted by Tristram and sees no prospect of a bright future with him, and thus, the rejection indicates the trope of unrequited love.

4.5 Metafiction and Metanarration

In the course of recounting the story, the narrator of the first-degree narrative reflects on the form or the discourse of his tale. Since the medium of his testimony allows for verbal ad hoc adjustments, Tristram corrects his utterances, recycles the language used, and consequently, produces a relatively improved version of the story. Therefore, metanarration in various forms permeates the narrative.

The court setting and witness hearing reflect the frame narrative and its single narrator, who divulges private matters before the audience in a relatively unrestricted manner. In that respect, Tristram alternates the course of his storytelling from the past to the present and refers to himself as the storyteller, all the while addressing the commission, interrupting, and teasing the attorney. First, the narrator is very careful how the content of his tale impacts the audience as in the following passage of confession regarding his relationship with Monsieur Deauville: “His voice on the other end of the line had guided me through the darkest episodes imaginable. I will not trouble you with that period of my life here. Suffice it to say that M. Deauville had held my hand through it [...]” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 47). It can be concluded that the main protagonist demonstrates self-awareness in the narration even when he fairly digresses from the point.

Second, the teller expresses compassion and understanding for the members of the Commission when he extols the view from Hilltop, his family heritage: “Forgive me if I sound like an estate agent. I have nothing left to sell” (43). By the use of the metanarrative reference, the narrator-protagonist checks himself after the prolonged description of Hilltop and apologizes to his listeners. Lastly, as he becomes more at home, the respect and consideration for the audience subside:

Huge sums of untaxed money were channelled through it [Castle Holdings] out to the shareholders of its parent companies, which is perfectly legal under Irish tax law, as you know. I did not make the laws. You made the laws. You are the lawmakers and must shoulder some blame. Me? I was merely the conduit. My appointment struck me as appropriate on a mordant level. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 73)

Tristram discloses the transaction details pertaining to the bank and then engages in a series of accusations, proposing punitive measures against the tribunal. On the other hand, he presents himself as a victim, and thus exploits his isolated and vulnerable position.

4.5.1 Types of Metanarration

A study into metacommentaries can be carried out according to Macrae's delineation of the metanarration types. As the sole creator of the story, the narrator gives voice to the experiencing and narrating self alternatively, causing the reader to stay alert and be wary of any sudden self-directed criticism or metanarrative remarks. Firstly, Tristram discloses details from his private life and is overwhelmed with emotions at times, which attributes to periodical corrections in retelling, as the following excerpt, rendered via metacompositional metanarration, shows: "I woke one ... I was going to say one morning, but there was no telling whether it was day or night in the priest hole" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 344). Another similar instance denotes the difficulty of recalling a story, especially when being interrogated in court: "'Tristram,' I offered, a name which inevitably sounds more formal to an Irish ear than *mister*. Castler, I should have told him. My name is Castler, how's the form?" (347). In this instance of dissonant narration, the wiser narrating self intrudes and corrects the mistake from the past while offering a more adequate response. Secondly, metadiegetic metanarration signifies the references to the discourse elements, such as the plot, characters, or setting (McRae), which can be observed in the following passage:

At this word, the birds stopped. The secret creatures in the undergrowth stopped. The very air, I tell you, stopped. I looked up. The historian and I stood alone on a spotlight stage, waiting to say our lines. We had been waiting to say them for years. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 359)

The narrator presents the characters in the novel as thespians performing in a theater. The voice of experiencing self resorts to the narrating mode and describes the scene, setting, and the two actors acting out a play in this short passage of metadiegetic commentary. In a similar way, the teller reflects on the awkward situation that has risen from a miscommunication: "'Here we are now,' he [Hickey] repeated, and inserted an expectant pause to prompt me to respond. I knew that I was forgetting something, but it wasn't my lines" (57). The reader will notice that the narrator's indication of the phrase "my lines" directs attention to the diegetic level by the use of metadiegetic metanarration. Moreover, the narrator-protagonist refers to the narrative plot by foreshadowing the terrifying episode he is about to disclose: "however, would it not be best for all concerned at this stage if you simply let me bash on? I'm getting to the really good bit, which is the really bad bit, the bit that still makes me shiver" (309). Tristram interrupts Fergus and requests to continue

testifying with the intention of creating suspense and preparing his audience for the nasty plot twist, which is the revealing of Monsieur Deauville's identity.

There are elements of metanarrative metanarration in the novel when the narrator gives epithets to his entire testimony and comments on its properties and structure. For instance, he states that "[t]here are no white areas in my [Tristram's] tale" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 88) and "Now that this whole protracted palaver is coming to an end, I find that I can't keep from blurting random incidental stuff" (346).

4.5.2 Virtual Embedded Narratives

The whole clandestine affair with Edel ends with Tristram's downfall. However, moments before Edel declares the breakup, Tristram imagines a bright future with her: "I sang gently to her, thinking that ... well, it's difficult to know precisely what I was thinking, except that I was thinking it very strongly at the time. Thinking it so strongly that I could see it. Us. A future together. Life" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 329). Tristram remains infatuated with Edel and shares his romantic thoughts in a proposal: "'[t]he castle is mine now. Come with me across the moors. [...] You always wanted to see inside the castle. Now you may. You are its princess. You shall have your own wing'" (330). However, this proposal and its appealing image represent a wishful thinking rather than a realistic expectation, which classifies the entire proposition as a virtual embedded narrative.

Furthermore, regrets belong to the same category, and Tristram recounts several. His expressions of remorse range from insignificant and comical to metaphysical and deeply religious. An example of the humorous effect of regret occurs when Tristram narrates the aftermath of alcohol induced hangover in which he examines the interior of Hickey's truck: "I spotted the hip flask wedged by the handbrake and gagged but kept it down, although I should have let rip all over Hickey's seat. If you ask me whether I have any regrets, yes I do and that is one" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 300). The effect on the audience is rather comical since the voice of the narrating self addresses the tribunal and speaks of regretting a triviality, instead of an action that may render him culpable in court, which would seem more appropriate given the circumstances. Furthermore, the narrator-protagonist feels remorseful for being greedy, looks back on the decisive moment from the past,

and comments wisely: “[...] he [Hickey] was on site. On the old site, that is. The original one. The one we should have stuck with” (264).

Lastly, virtual embedded narratives provide an undertone to the narrator’s understanding of the significance and magical power of words in the novel. At the Oldcastle farm, subsequent to the supernatural experience of witnessing the eyes of a creature (probably the devil’s manifestation), Hickey and Tristram run to the truck and leave the farm in terror, silence, and hurry. Then Tristram phrases the question: “‘But what if it [the creature] escapes? I said and immediately regretted voicing the question, because in referring to it I had confirmed that there as an It’” (251). The reader may infer that by proclaiming that the creature with yellow glowing eyes may survive and escape, the narrator-protagonist acknowledges its existence. Similar to the narrator’s interpretation of the horrific creature, Tristram develops an aphorism of a kind “‘[t]he Devil was invented by man, Dessie.’ And like the nuclear bomb, once we invented him, we could not uninvent him” (254). The narrator-protagonist links the fictive invention of the Oldcastle creature with the creation of the notion of the Devil, enhancing the feeling of regret by the use of literary irony.

The disnarrated events do not represent mere products of the narrator’s wild imagination. By the use of this metafictional device, the narrator-protagonist subtly voices his opinion about the other characters in the story, especially his partner Hickey. Upon hearing that the loan for the construction of the hotel on the Claremont site is granted “Hickey lit up. I [Tristram] thought he was coming over to shake my hand but he walked right past me, gauging his location in relation to the perimeter wall, the road, the railway line” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 101). This instance of Hickey’s self-centeredness and disrespect for Tristram is supported by the following passage, when Tristram envisages how Hickey would show his true face: “if this worked, he [Hickey] would become an extremely wealthy man. Wealthy enough to buy the Castle and Environs out from my father several times over, to buy any castle he wanted. A millennium-old order would be overturned in a matter of months” (240). Furthermore, the same strategy is applied when Tristram substitutes important clues about Monsieur Deauville for his own ideas that are seemingly not grounded in reality and eventually countered or denarrated: “I would not have been in the least bit surprised had M. Deauville revealed to me that he could trace a direct line to the Medici princes, or to Alexander the Great, or Ivan the Terrible. But he did not reveal any such thing to me. He revealed nothing at all” (89). This passage suggests how little Tristram knows about Monsieur Deauville, however, based

on their previous familiarity, Tristram assumes that he is of logical, methodical, and prudent personality:

I waited for M. Deauville to plead caution – to plead reason – to point out that this whole thing was getting out of hand, that it was one matter when we were talking about the site across the road from the castle gates where I could keep an eye on things, keep an eye on Hickey, but that we now appeared to be entering a realm of fantasy. *Tocka tocka* on the other end of the phone until even that petered out and I was listening to silence. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 234)

In a state of confusion, the narrator-protagonist tries to grasp the gravity and danger of the international property endeavor and to calm himself by imagining a response he expects to hear from M. Deauville. The denarrated fictive reply is rendered in a conversational format, however other forms are present as well, such as imagined descriptions: “[d]esiccated mouse droppings and insect legs; woodlouse shells and the bristles of rats. That was my guess, anyway. That’s how I pictured my den. I had no idea what I was sitting in” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 341), or invalidated depictions pregnant with sarcasm and hyperbole:

Hickey kept his face averted for fear of being photographed in conversation with me by the surveillance man with the telescopic lens who appeared on the rooftops of his mind gathering evidence against him whenever he was up to no good, i.e. more often than not, though the point of this particular charade escaped me. No one could see us through the fogged-up glass. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 53)

4.5.3 Metanarrative Signs

It is a common habit of the narrator-protagonist to express his attitude to various character’s statements, either straightforwardly or, more often, silently to the reader in a way metanarrative sings. Furthermore, the same practice is applied to his own utterances, however such recurrent remarks in the form of proverbs and idioms ironically and indirectly allude to the presence of the devil. The idiomatic expressions in the novel refer to the linguistic code and can as such be delineated as metalinguistic signs (Prince). For instance, “M. Deauville had some questions to answer. At that moment, my mobile rang. *Unknown*. Speak of the devil. I excused myself and climbed out of the truck” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 98). The full importance of the idiomatic expression “speak of the devil” in the text is known only to the reader, as M. Deauville represents evil incarnate. The subtle word play is evident in the following passage when Tristram comments on

M. Deauville's absence on the Claremont launch day: "He [M. Deauville] didn't come and he didn't ring either but he was there in spirit. I see that now. I see it all now. Every aspect of the launch bore his hallmark. *The Devil* is in the detail" (190; emphasis added). The manner of narration shifts from dissonant to consonant as Tristram experiences an epiphanic moment. By modifying the idiom from the general "devil" to the very particular "the Devil", the audience becomes aware that the narrator of the first-degree narrative is cognizant of M. Deauville's hidden identity and may expect the moment of realization later in the story. The literary device of metanarrative signs is repeated in the following passage as well:

I took out my phone and searched for the next available flight back to Mumbai. There was nothing until the following evening. It was Easter and the airlines were booked out. A whole afternoon to kill and no notion of how to kill it. *The Devil makes work for idle hands*. For trembling ones too, for hands with the DTs. I booked a room in an airport hotel. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 354; emphasis added)

The narrator's periodical expressions in the form of metanarrative signs signify the numinous manifestations of the devil, antecede its involvement in the story world, and thus, create suspense and engage the reader in storytelling.

Metanarrative signs maintain a similar effect on the reader when idiomatic expressions that contain the word "hell" are added by the narrator-protagonist. Tristram comments on certain situations using phrases such as "sheer hell" (82), "not a chance in hell" (90), and "bloody hell" (269). Given the elements of magical realism in the novel, these idioms, exclaimed by the protagonist, might be considered as telltale signs or unintentional invocatory phrases of the devil's presence when compared with the following event in the story. The incident that most strikingly alludes to the verbal summoning of the evil spirit happens at the moments before and after the clinical death of the main character:

The cleaners found me comatose and called 999, but the phone must have been upside down and 666 dialled in the panic because it was Hell that I was despatched to, and not hospital, make no mistake. Sheer hell. [...] when I came around and demanded to know where the hell I was and how the hell I'd gotten there and who the hell had stolen my clothes. Hell, hell, hell. I couldn't stop saying that word. Still can't. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 82)

Immediately after his release from hospital, Tristram receives a phone call from M. Deauville who starts to counsel him in maintaining sobriety, which may symbolically imply that the accidental conjuring of the devil has been established (85).

Tristram opens his testimony with the story about surviving an airplane crash in Dublin. During the vertical dive of the airplane, Tristram notices the city lights through the window and has an idea: “[t]his is it, I thought. *To hell with it*” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 8; emphasis added). The narrator withholds the information from the reader and does not clarify the intention until it becomes evident that he has decided to reach for the drinks cart. It can be concluded that the main protagonist, facing certain death, makes a choice to have one last sip of alcohol. An analogy can be seen between this one and a later episode in Tristram’s tale when he succumbs to Hickey’s violent and forceful demands to drink alcohol with him: “Hickey bayed at me, gripping a hand of my hair. I glimpsed the end of the pier over his shoulder and then the truck was launched. A fleeting airborne moment between this life and the next. This is it, I thought, *to hell with it*. I gulped the whiskey down” (297; emphasis added). Prior to this episode in the story, Tristram and his partner Hickey have suffered a terrible shock of failure in the investment business. The narrator-protagonist perceives these two situations as transitions to the afterlife. The irony behind the saying “to hell with it” appears to presuppose the horrific ending of the novel in which it is implied, during the conversation with the local historian, that Tristram steps down into the realm of hell (360).

4.5.4 Metaleptic Commentaries

In *The Devil I Know*, metaleptic commentaries in the form of metaleptic moves mark the transgression of discourse boundaries as certain characters from the embedded narrative appear in the frame narrative as well. At one point during Tristram’s confession, Fergus O’Reilly enquires about the barbeque and compares the information from Hickey’s and McGee’s testimonies with the details from Tristram’s story (Kilroy, *The Devil* 221). Based on this example, the reader becomes aware that the two characters who are mentioned in Tristram’s tale (second-degree narrative) also testify before the same court and attorney (first-degree narrative).

In addition to the appearance of the protagonists from the embedded storyline in the frame narrative, it is not clear what role Edel Hickey would play if she showed herself in court. Tristram recounts: “I had never touched another man’s wife before, but that is beside the point. I no longer understand the point. I no longer know why I’m here. Just that I am here but she [Edel] is not and that is the end of that” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 245). Even though Justice O’Reilly enquired about her

involvement in the property scam (131), Edel's absence may highlight the unrequited love trope more than her incrimination, based on Tristram's confession. Nevertheless, the most striking presence of a character from the embedded narrative in the first-degree narrative is certainly Monsieur Deauville's. On the last day of evidence, Tristram pays a visit to his abandoned castle and is joined there by a mysterious person whom Tristram identifies as "a local historian". Their brief conversation ends with a fantastic episode, in which the historian ushers Tristram "through a stile" that leads to "the other side" where he hears the sound of hoofs: "[t]ocka tocka. Deauville had come to collect. A debt must be settled. That is the nature of a debt. The Devil linked my arm and we began the descent" (360-361). This final passage of the novel has an astounding effect on the audience not only because the main protagonist is about to meet the evil incarnate for the first time in person, but also because the reader is the sole witness to this fantastic event, which adds to the suspense. The Devil's manifestations are consonant with the literary genre of 'magical realism', and are, therefore, present at both narrative levels of Tristram's tale, which may paradoxically add to the reliability of the narrator.

4.5.5 Disnarrated Events

There are multiple chunks of text that contain descriptions, images, and ponderings of the male protagonist in *The Devil I Know*. A substantial part of this body does not correspond to the reality in the story world and represents counterfactuals or disnarrated events. Such events remain figments of the narrator's imagination and shed light on his train of thought and emotions. Continual passages in the novel that refer to Tristram's secret relationship with Edel evidently showcase this narrative technique:

He [Hickey] sat down on the other side of the desk, put his head in his hands and shook his great mane slowly. Oh Lord God, I realised, he knows. He knows that I am in love with his wife, and that his wife is in love with me. How could he not know? The birds were singing about it in the trees. The sun was shining about it in the sky. Yes, we had been seeing each other all summer, Edel and I [...] Finally, he raised his face. 'The Viking,' he told me darkly. 'Oh,' I said in relief. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 267-268)

The voice of the experiencing self expresses Tristram's fear of Hickey's revenge and states that the adultery seems obvious and easily perceptible. By the end of the passage, the tension is released,

the entire idea of Tristram being in trouble vanishes, and thus, the validity of the premonition is denied. Soon afterwards, Hickey grabs Tristram's phone, hoping to find Monsieur Deauville's number, however he notices that Edel has dialed Tristram's number recently and asks the question: "[h]ere, why did me wife call you this morning?" (271). At that moment Tristram's phone starts ringing and the awkward situation is momentarily forgotten and postponed. Nevertheless, immediately after finishing the conversation with M. Deauville, Tristram ponders:

I put the phone back in my pocket after we had completed a quick run-through of the Steps. Because she is worried about you. Your wife called me this morning because she is worried about you. She thinks you're working too hard so she called me to ask after your welfare. Which is why her number showed up on my phone. That's what I would tell him. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 272)

After hanging up, Tristram's immediate thought was Edel, so he carefully rehearses the lines he would use as an excuse if interrogated again about the incident. However, there is no necessity to put the plan in action as the topic becomes irrelevant and of little importance to Hickey. Therefore, the train of thought is rendered in the form of the disnarrated and consonant narration.

4.5.6 Denarrated events

As it is explained in the chapter on metanarration, denarrated events can be understood as negations of the narrator's statements inevitably followed by the subsequent novel interpretation of the recounted incident. An exemplary passage of this type of counter-facts can be observed in an episode involving a heated discussion between Hickey and Tristram about a belief in the Devil. Hickey confides in Tristram that he witnessed the Devil's manifestation at a friendly gathering followed by the immediate and accidental death of their school friend Shane. When asked if he remembers Shane, Tristram negates the acquaintance to the best of his recollection (Kilroy, *The Devil* 252). Sometime later, Hickey reiterates his notion regarding the incident and Tristram starts wondering: "I [Hickey] know what I seen that night. I know the Devil was standing at that bonfire. An I know that two hours later me mate Shane was dead.' Why had I [Tristram] denied knowing Shane? I remember Shane well enough [sic] (254). The sensible narrator ponders on the reasons behind the original lie and discloses the truth to the reader rendered in consonant narration. It may be safe to assume that the feeling of repulsion to Hickey modifies honesty in Tristram's retorts,

who remarks the builder's actions, behavior, and describes his appearance with disgust. Therefore, Tristram admits the truth eventually despite the motivation unknown to him.

The reader can witness multiple humorous descriptions of Hickey's hairiness in the story: "[t]he top buttons of his shirt had come undone, revealing a lewd tangle of chest hair. I [Tristram] didn't like to gawp so I focused on Miss September's cleavage instead" (270). Moments later, Tristram relates: "I sat back and looked at his calendar. Miss September had no hair other than on her head, which struck me as connected to some pathology of Hickey's, what with his being so hirsute and Miss September being so —" (273). The narrator repeatedly mocks and ridicules Hickey for his hairy appearance to the reader, however an instance of denarration counters the foregoing gross depictions. One night at the door entrance of Hickey's residence, Edel meets Tristram who tries to persuade her to elope together. During this encounter, Hickey, unaware of the couple, enters the kitchen in the background: "She [Edel] turned and I caught sight of him [Hickey] over her shoulder, standing with his back to us in the kitchen, barefoot in his jocks. Not that hairy after all" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 330). The last comment discards the image of the disgustingly hairy Hickey, which is carefully honed by the narrator-protagonist, who uses conceits, disnarration, hyperbole, synecdoche, alliteration, and other literary mechanisms. Nevertheless, the narrator's various depictions of Hickey as a detestable ape-like character seem to stem from the feeling of long-lasting hatred since the bullying days in school. This attributes to the suspicion in his allegedly infallible narration and marks him as a duplicitous narrator. The manner in which Tristram delivers presentations of Hickey's looks parallels Anna's descriptions of Kel from *All Summer*. Both main narrator-protagonists appear to have their own ulterior motivations for treating characters with disrespect and for distorting the images in which they are presented to the reader.

It may be claimed that the most surprising moment in the entire novel occurs when Tristram realizes that Monsieur Deauville is the Devil incarnate, which is skillfully rendered in an instance of denarration. The experiencing self is oblivious of the uncanny behavior and manifestations of Monsieur Deauville, and therefore, the wiser narrating self comments on his personality and provides clues to the reader, which reflects the use of irony in works of literature. This misconception originates from the faulty understanding of the sponsor's name: "I [Tristram] cannot confirm the spelling. *Perhaps I misheard him on the hospital steps.* Perhaps he was not Laurent Deauville but Laurent de Ville, Lawrence of the City, the ultimate urbanite, the bottom line in sophistication" (Kilroy, *The Devil* 89; emphasis added). The main protagonist fails to perceive that

he is contacted and assisted by the Devil incarnate, hence appropriates the name to his own listening comprehension. Until late in the investigation, the information of his identity is kept secret from the attorney by the narrator-protagonist, who repeatedly designates him as the “sponsor”.

Prior to the final revelation, the voice of the experiencing self recounts the meeting with Larney who “broke into a mocking jig to showcase them [his feet]. *Tocka tocka, tocka tocka*. Not fingertips flying across a keyboard but the sound of hooves (334). This realization of some strange connection between Monsieur Deauville and Larney is further validated, when the latter changes the tone of his voice: “That cultured tone. He was speaking in M. Deauville’s voice” (334). The misunderstanding is communicated to Tristram by the same individual: “‘It’s *deh*-ville. *Deh*-ville, not *doh*-ville, yes?’” (336), who even spells the word “devil” to the naïve, stupefied and terrified Tristram. The circle of denarration is completed when Tristram’s false conviction is overturned and the reference to the initial phone conversation is mentioned: “*You said your name was Deauville*. ‘Don’t give me that. You heard what you wanted to hear” (336). From a point of narrative study, with the postponement of revelations, the narratological importance of suspense (and its code) increases (Cohan and Shires 124). For the most part of the second-degree narrative, the protagonist is impervious to the influence of the illusive evil forces around him and lives in conviction that Monsieur Deauville is his counselor, benefactor, and confidant, which engages the reader to attentively participate in the final suspenseful realization. By the use of denarration, the evil incarnate’s entire scheme is unveiled, and the previous notions of the reader are dispelled.

4.6 Speech Representation

Similar to *All Summer*, the speech in *The Devil I Know* is predominantly represented by a single character. The narrator-protagonist gives the testimony at court and retrieves from his memory the story about his participation in the clandestine operation of property acquisition. In the frame narrative, Tristram’s entire account may be seen as a quoted monologue, given the fact that the witness’s deposition is recorded and delivered to the chief attorney and commission, whereas, in the second-degree narrative, the narrator-protagonist engages in alternating modes of mind representation with the self-narration as the prevalent type, which allows the classification of the novel as autobiographical.

4.6.1 Consonant and Dissonant Self-narration

The character of Tristram in the embedded narrative, being of a timid and taciturn personality, rarely opposes Hickey or other characters straightforwardly and seldom utters his thoughts openly. The earl rather keeps the remarks, preferences, and opinions to himself and the reader. He astutely points out to the flaws in the property scam and grudgingly states to the narratee: “when did anybody ever listen to me?” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 111). This mode of mind representation proves to be very effective at exposing the inner struggle with alcohol addiction in a poetical way: “I thought about the amber bottle. I couldn’t stop thinking about the amber bottle. The cool heft of it in my hand, the tiny pocket of sanctuary it promised. If I could just squeeze myself into the amber bottle and screw the lid back on, seal myself off” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 9). The mental images of relapsing into drinking are highlighted by the transition from the consonant to dissonant narration, i.e. from the experiencing mode to the narrating one: “[a] cubic pint of deepest black. I was holding my soul, distilled into liquid and aching to be reunited with my body, howling to be poured back in. I brought the glass closer again. I knew this would happen. I wanted this to happen. I still want it to happen. I always will” (23). A careful reader will acknowledge the smooth transitions between the tenses. The subtle grammatical change (from Past Simple to Present Simple) is an indication of the move to the voice of the narrating self and the corresponding comments as shown in the following lines: “[a]n amber of whiskey had slashed my shoulder. I [Tristram] touched the stain and looked at the moisture on my fingerprints as if it were my life’s blood, and sometimes I think it is. Sometimes I think that whiskey is my life’s blood” (167). The lines in the Present Simple tense may be regarded as the subsequent comments on the previous narration in the Past Simple related by the narrating self to the commission.

These previously analyzed instances rendered in consonant and dissonant narration successively foreshadow the narrator’s relapse into drinking. The combination of narrative forms is an effective strategy for foreshadowing the outcomes of dubious actions. For instance, the narrator resorts to this technique when he examines Hickey who “thought it [being optimistic] made him charming, a bit of a character, a lovable rogue, but although he was fooling no one, it was still somehow endearing in its sheer ham-fistedness. His fists of ham and my feet of clay. How did we get so far?”

(57). By phrasing the question rendered in dissonant self-narration, Tristram, from a distance in time and space, expresses his amazement and disbelief at the relative success of their endeavors. The same narrative technique is paired with other literary devices such as denarration as can be seen in the following passage. Hickey calls Tristram “the brains” in front of the Golden Circle members, and the voice of the narrator is heard: “[t]he men laughed at that and Hickey laughed loudest of all. I lowered my head in admission. Yes, it’s true. The brains are stored in this receptacle, me. I provide them so that Hickey doesn’t have to. Only it wasn’t true. I wasn’t the brains. I was just stupid enough to think I was” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 139). The reader is presented with two opposing opinions separated in time and belonging to different narrative levels. The more experienced narrator considers and comments on his own past bewilderment by the use of the speech representation that is intended here to evoke sympathy in the audience. Since the “narrator [...] audibly proclaims his or her subjective opinions”, the principles of discordant narration can be applied to the novel (Cohn, *Discordant Narration* 307).

Furthermore, consonant narration proves to be one of the finest literary tools used to expose hypocrisy and greed of the unscrupulous bankers in the novel. When greeted by O’Dee, Tristram shrewdly inspects his intention: “[w]elcome home, man,’ he said as sincerely as he was able, though no affection or camaraderie had ever existed between us. This display was strictly for the benefit of the others, to demonstrate that we went back, that there was history, that it was kosher” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 139). The narrator-protagonist confidently lays open the hidden motives behind O’Dee’s gestures, whereas there are moments when he is uncertain of his own interpretations. For instance, he confronts Hickey about the missing chandelier at the Hilltop to which the builder replies: “[h]ow was I supposed to know that?” he countered angrily, meaning: I wouldn’t have nicked the chandelier had I known it belonged to you. Actually, who knows what he meant” (45). Tristram tries to decipher what is implied in Hickey’s response and eventually ceases to make the effort. On the other hand, during the affair with Edel, he gives much thought when Hickey refuses to discuss matters about his wife:

Silence as my mind worried this nugget of information into shreds. What did *Don’t talk to me* mean? Was it the same as *Ah sure, you know yourself?* I pressed my eye against this peephole into their marriage but I was on the wrong side of the door. [...] *Don’t talk to me* as in: Edel doesn’t love me any more, the marriage is gone, or *Don’t talk to me* as in: I suspect she’s having it off with another man an I’m going to kill him with my bare hands when I find out who he is. [sic] (Kilroy, *The Devil* 283-284)

The narrator-protagonist puzzles over the meaning behind Hickey's words and shares his ideas with the reader. His train of thought diverges into optimistic and pessimistic expectations, respectively. Moreover, Tristram momentarily assumes the builder's idiolect as he imagines the unspoken confessions from Hickey. As it is the case with many Tristram's conceptions, these visualizations of Hickey's utterances, rendered in consonant narration, appear to be purely fictional, and thus, denarrated.

Action time is condensed at the expense of narration time whenever consonant mode of narration is adopted, which is most evident in symbiosis with descriptions of nature that bear profound meaning and menacing implications:

The surface of the sea was ruckled black and silver. Like life, I remember thinking, for in my heated state of mind everything reflected my predicament. The surface of the sea was like life: an overwhelming, unending onslaught of peaks and troughs, but silence and darkness if you let yourself go under. As I had gone under once before (Kilroy, *The Devil* 289).

Tristram depicts the sea's surface in a poetic style and provides an analogy between the way he perceives the water and his state of mind. Therefore, by revealing his inner thoughts to the reader, he displays awareness of his own troubled mind and even continues in the same deprecating tone of narration: "[t]he fish heads, the crab claws, the lobster shells and all the other gutted creatures. I suppose I fitted right in. A hollow man, a human shell" (290). However, true mastery of conveying inner ideas to the reader by the use of consonant self-narration is not only evident in depictions of non-living things, but also in profound analyses of the characters in the narrator-protagonist's immediate surroundings. For instance, the first accidental meeting with Hickey, the archetype of the Irish conman, who claims to be Tristram's "oul pal", initiates a flashback and a wave of negative emotions: "[t]hen he [Hickey] laughed and it was the laugh that did it. Watching him laugh at me triggered a memory of him laughing at me many moons ago. It was the act of ridicule that I recognized, the utter freedom he felt in expressing it, and my utter powerlessness in having to listen to it. This man was never my oul pal" (14). The surge of emotions accompanied by the memory of bad blood between the leading protagonists introduce the mood and tone of the entire novel – hypocritical, clandestine, and malicious. By the use of this cognitive capacity of Tristram, rendered in consonant narration, the reader is presented with the characters' dark side of their personality, as can be seen when he meticulously evaluates Ray Lawless's actions: "[a] character entirely bereft of social graces, I concluded, a brute escaped from the zoo, at which assessment Lawless whipped

around to glare at me, as if he had overheard me think it. [...] a man with no tolerance for human frailty. I knew his type” (111). The same method is applied when exposing the criminal past of the Viking: “[e]veryone on the hill knew that the Viking had been handed down a suspended sentence for breaking a former girlfriend’s jaw. Somehow, this hadn’t impacted on his social standing” (198). This mind reading technique can also illuminate the intentions behind apparently benevolent gestures. For instance, at the Viking’s VIP lounge, the act of Svetlana taking the drinks order from Tristram and Hickey is followed by the Viking’s entrance who asks if they have been looked after properly. Tristram perceives the sinister tone of his question and comments: “[i]t was not a hospitable enquiry but a power display: there would be consequences for Svetlana if she did not take care of his friends” (200). The narrator-protagonist is persistent about showing that there is no place for kindness in this story world as even seemingly sincere acts of politeness and hospitality are tainted with malice.

At moments certain interpretations in the form of consonant narration, seem to stifle the process of telling as the narrator-protagonist persistently tries to show how irritated he is: He [Hickey] turned his back and headed off, holding up a valedictory hand in that way that used to drive me mad when I had less to be driven mad by (what made him so very positive that I was looking at him?) but then he paused, dropped his head, relented, and turned around. ‘Lookit,’ he said, as if making a major concession [...]” (189). In this regard, the reader is bombarded by the narrator’s comments. As a result, the formation of reader’s opinions about the other characters in the story may be thwarted.

This type of narration utilizes rare epiphanic moments in the novel, for instance, when the male protagonist realizes the untold motivations of other characters. Subsequent to Tristram’s proposition of leaving the meeting with the Golden Circle, Hickey “threw me [Tristram] this imploring, panicked look: don’t ruin this for me, *please*. It wasn’t the wealth that Hickey was after, I saw then, or not only the wealth, but also the opportunity to sit at the big boys’ table, to be on the other side of the fence for once in his life” (236). By the use of consonant narration and internal focalization, an alternative explanation of Hickey’s aspirations is straightforwardly delivered to the reader. This strategy allows for immediate corrections in the narrator-protagonist’s speech and points out the discrepancy between utterances and their implications, for instance, when Tristram and Hickey try to find their way to the Oldcastle farm by car, Tristram has a bad feeling and says: “‘This can’t be right, Dessie,’ I said, but what I meant was: Dessie, this is wrong” (249). The episode including Tristram’s hangover depicts the struggle to express the thoughts of the

experiencing self clearly and intelligibly: “[i]t [the pole] supported a bright yellow life-ring holder from which the life ring had been removed. The life rang ring a bell. I tried again: the life ring rang a bell. Despite its absence, I had a distinct mental image of it – it was new and tomato red” (301). The mistake in the narrating process is promptly corrected, and thus, attributes to the reader’s experience of the negative influence alcohol leaves on the protagonist and the productive process of wording a narrative.

4.6.2 Self-narrated and Self-quoted Monologues

Besides consonant and dissonant self-narration, the narrator engages in monologues that are either narrated or quoted. During the episodes when the reader is not certain if the statements are uttered by the narrator or the experiencing self, it may be safe to assume that the passages are rendered in self-narrated monologues. One such case highlights an anomaly in the apparently honest relationship between Tristram and Monsieur Deauville. When asked about the reason behind joining Hickey at the pub, Tristram replies that the builder has a business proposition, however there is an explanation to this partly true response: “[c]learly, this was a disingenuous representation of the previous evening’s sequence of events. I had entered the licensed premises because I was gasping for a drink. Hickey only mentioned his proposition as I was leaving” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 40). The source of ambiguity lies in the exact wording as there are no clear indicators of the narrator’s mediacy. The confusion arises from the fact that the content of the passage may be uttered to the tribunal at the first level of narration or it is the narrator-protagonist who reveals his thoughts at the second level. Regardless of the voice of the person who gives the explanation (narrating self or experiencing self) and the degree of narration, both interpretations seem valid and point to Tristram’s fear of Monsieur’s Deauville’s abandonment or retribution.

Throughout the novel, Tristram repeats the same piece of advice that he presumably learned from his sponsor in the Alcoholics Anonymous program, Monsieur Deauville – “[a]ccept the things you cannot change, I silently coached myself” (Kilroy, *The Devil* 45). The narrator engages in self-quoted monologues that are clearly marked by the speech tags to indicate the inner struggle: “I told myself over and over again that I accepted the things that I could not change, but I didn’t, and I couldn’t, and I wouldn’t, but I had to” (204). The mantra appears in the story at the moments when

Tristram is on the verge of relapsing into drinking, however the effect of these words maintains him under control and at the will of his sponsor, which is something Tristram is aware of – “but M. Deauville felt that it was a necessary step in my recovery that I return to the VIP den immediately to face down my fears, so in the end I complied, having first admitted to him that I was powerless over alcohol and then accepted the things I could not change, i.e. everything” (202). Eventually, Tristram frees himself from Monsieur Deauville’s influence and starts thinking independently and clearly in the period after the relapse and his father’s death. He assumes an insubordinate attitude, takes a critical approach to his sponsor’s suggestions, and realizes that these slogans, rendered in quoted monologue, are ineffective and to a degree meaningless:

My [Tristram’s] brain had slipped into its default groove and was chanting the usual repetitive guff – admitting that I was powerless over alcohol, humbly asking my Higher Power to restore me to sanity, accepting the things that I could not change and all the rest of it, when it struck me that it was nonsense. That I was chanting pure nonsense and had been for some time. ‘Do you hear yourself?’ Hickey had asked me, and suddenly I did. I did not accept the things I could not change. I would change the things I could not accept. Starting with Edel. (Kilroy, *The Devil* 327)

Subsequent to the relapse into drinking, the sobering moment occurs when the narrator-protagonist adopts a new mindset, which adds to the absurd series of events. The narrator-protagonist becomes a daring man of action and abandons the previous patterns of deviant behavior, albeit too late. This repetition of the series, rendered in self-quoted monologues, has kept the male protagonist under control and attributed to his submissiveness.

5. Conclusion

This thesis has set out to bring a fresh view on two works of fiction by the distinguished Irish author from a narratological standpoint. The first chapter of the analysis investigates the instances in which the narrators’ unreliability is exposed by the language they use to recount the memory-dependent events. Besides openly complaining about being infallible, the main narrator-protagonists of both novels show signs of incongruous speech and evidence of contradictory statements. The repetition of fabricated episodes may be understood as the consequence of severe physical and psychological trauma both tellers have suffered. The second chapter on narrative time

sheds light on the temporal narrative devices employed by the author. It appears that sequential ordering of key events proves to be an efficient tool for developing characterization and creating suspense in readers. At the expense of occasional summaries, scenic representations of events (in the form of dialogues and scenes) abound the novels and offer insight into the emotional and psychological state of the narrators. Time in the two novels is periodically retarded to ease the transition from one narrative level to another (*All Summer*), or to summarize the previous actions and point to the extratextual political affairs (*The Devil I Know*).

The analysis of the narrative situation allows for a convenient comparison of the overall structure of the two novels. The presence of intradiegetic narrators in the first- and second-degree narratives of both novels is indicated by the findings in the third chapter, whereas the female narrator-protagonist of *All Summer* acts as an extradiegetic narrator as well. As the analysis shows, the plotlines in hyponarratives of *All Summer* and *The Devil I Know* function as explanations of their respective frame narratives that embed them. Moreover, they both share the same goal of persuading the audience in order to fulfil the narrators' ulterior motivations. As far as retrospective focalization is concerned, the examination in the fourth chapter illustrates a development in the overall perspective taking – from the predominantly narrator-focalization mode in *All Summer* to the rich combination of both character- and narrator-focalization in *The Devil I Know*. Focalized objects are perceived internally and externally, however in the latter novel, the male narrator-protagonist also becomes focalized at the level of action in the second-degree narrative. Pertaining to the metanarrative references, the fifth chapter closely inspects those instances that indicate the discursive aspect of narration or diegesis. With the help of Macrae's delineation of the types of metanarration, metaleptic moves, and metanarrative signs, the analysis provides evidence of a vast variety in metanarrative expressions. Furthermore, *The Devil I Know* appears to be replete with denarrated and disnarrated events, whose presence necessitates further investigation into the language and mindset of the male narrator-protagonist. The final chapter of the analysis considers the occasional shifts in the narrator's voice and the motives behind the alternative use of psycho-narration, self-narration, and monologues. The investigation provides fruitful results concerned with expressing the emotional state of the narrators, especially their irritation and regret, when the combination of dissonant and consonant narration is employed. On the other hand, instances of psycho-narration that offer ambiguous interpretations in *All Summer* call for great engagement

from the reader side. Lastly, this narratological analysis of the two novels cannot be claimed to be definitive and conclusive and invites further research into the contemporary Irish novels.

6. Bibliography

Abbot, H. Porter. *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Alber, Jan, and Fludernik, Monika. Introduction. *Postclassical Narratology: Approaches and Analyses*. Ed. Jan Alber and Monika Fludernik. Columbus: The Ohio State UP, 2010. 1-31.

Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. 3rd ed. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2009.

Baldick, Chris. "Conceit." *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2015.

---. "Synecdoche." *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2015.

Bronwen, Thomas. *Fictional Dialogue: Speech and Conversation in the Modern and Postmodern novel*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska, 2012.

Brütsch, Matthias. "Irony, Retroactivity and Ambiguity: Three Kinds of "Unreliable Narration" in Literature and Film." *Unreliable Narration and Trustworthiness: Intermedial and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Ed. Vera Nünning. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 2015. Kindle file

Booth, Wayne. "Distance and Point of View: An Essay in Classification." *Essentials of the Theory of Fiction*. 3rd ed. Ed. Michael Hoffman and Patrick Murphy. Durham: Duke UP. 2005. 83-99.

---. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 1961. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 1983.

Chihaia, Matei. "Introductions to Narratology. Theory, Practice and the Afterlife of Structuralism." *DIEGESIS. Interdisziplinäres E-Journal für Erzählforschung* 1 (2012): 15-31.

Cirlot, J. E. "Death." *A Dictionary of Symbols*. 2nd Ed. London: Routledge, 2001.

- Cobley, Paul. *Narrative*. 2001. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Cohan, Steven and Linda Shires. *Telling Stories: A Theoretical Analysis of Narrative Fiction*. 1988. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Cohn, Dorrit. *Transparent Minds*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1978.
- . "Discordant Narration." *Style* 34 (Spring 2000): 307-316.
- Coste, Didier and Pier, John. "Narrative Levels." *Handbook of Narratology*. Ed. Peter Hühn et al. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009. 295-308.
- Dannenberg, Hilary P. "Gerald Prince and the Fascination of What Doesn't Happen." *Narrative* 22(3) (Fall 2014): 304-311.
- De Jong, Irene J. F. *Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2014.
- Faris, Wendy B. *Ordinary Enchantments: Magical Realism and the Remystification of Narrative*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 2004.
- Farner, Geir. *Literary Fiction: The Ways We Read Narrative Literature*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014.
- Ferber, Michael. "Milk." *A Dictionary of Literary Symbols*. 2nd Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Ferguson, Molly E. "Paying the Devil His Due: Alcoholism and the Faustian Bargain in Claire Kilroy's Novels." *Nordic Irish Studies* 15 (2016): 57-78.
- Fludernik, Monika. *An Introduction to Narratology*. London: Routledge, 2009.
- . "Metanarrative and Metafictional Commentary: From Metadiscursivity to Metanarration and Metafiction." *Poetica* 35 (2003): 1-39.
- . "Scene Shift, Metalepsis, and the Metaleptic Mode." *Style* 37 (Winter 2003): 382-400.
- Genette, Gerard. "Time and Narrative in *A la recherche du temps perdu*." *Essentials of the Theory of Fiction*. 3rd ed. Ed. Michael Hoffman and Patrick Murphy. Durham: Duke UP. 2005. 121-138.
- . *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. New York: Cornell UP, 1980.

- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. Der Tragödie erster Teil. Ed. Michael Pullen. 2010. *The Project Gutenberg*. 14 Sept. 2019. < <http://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/2229/pg2229-images.html>>.
- Grishakova, Marina. "Interface Ontologies: On the Possible, Virtual, and Hypothetical in Fiction." *Possible Worlds Theory and Contemporary Narratology*. Ed. Alice Bell and Marie-Laure Ryan. Lincoln: U of Nebraska, 2019. 88-109.
- Hänninen, Kirsi. "Perspectives on the Narrative Construction of Emotions." *Elore* 14 (2007): 1-9.
- Herman, David. *Basic Elements of Narrative*. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- . *Storytelling and the Sciences of Mind*. Cambridge: MIT P, 2013.
- Herman, Luc and Vervaeck, Bart, *Handbook of Narrative Analysis*. 2001. Trans. Luc Herman and Bart Vervaeck. Lincoln: U of Nebraska, 2005.
- Hogan, Patrick Colm. *Affective Narratology: The Emotional Structure of Stories*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2011.
- Johnstone, Barbara. "Discourse Analysis and Narrative." *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Ed. Deborah Schiffrin et al. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2001. 635-649.
- Keen, Suzanne. *Narrative Form*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Kilroy, Claire. *All Summer*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 2004.
- . *All Names Have Been Changed*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 2009.
- . *Tenderwire*. 2006. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 2007.
- . *The Devil I Know*. New York: Grove P, 2012.
- Lodge, David. *The Art of Fiction*. New York: Viking Penguin, 1993.
- Macrae, Andrea. *Discourse Deixis in Metafiction: The Language of Metanarration, Metalepsis and Disnarration*. New York: Routledge, 2019.
- McGlynn, Mary. „no difference between the different kinds of yesterday:" The Neoliberal Present in *The Green Road*, *The Devil I Know*, and *The Lives of Women*. *Literature Interpretation Theory* 28 (2017): 34-54.

- Meister, Jan Christoph. "Narratology as Discipline: A Case for Conceptual Fundamentalism." *What is Narratology?: Questions and Answers Regarding the Status of a Theory*. Ed. Tom Kindt and Hans-Harald Müller. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003. 55-71.
- Civil Rules & Practice Directions: Part 32 - Evidence*. Ministry of Justice. 2017. 27. Apr. 2020. <<https://www.justice.gov.uk/courts/procedure-rules/civil/rules/part32>>.
- Niederhoff, Burkhard. "Focalization." *Handbook of Narratology*. Ed. Peter Hühn et al. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009. 204-211.
- Neumann, Birgit, and Ansgar Nünning. "Metanarration and Metafiction." *Handbook of Narratology*. Ed. Peter Hühn et al. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009. 204-211.
- Nünning, Ansgar. "Unreliable Narration zur Einführung: Grundzüge einer kognitiv-narratologischen Theorie und Analyse unglaublichen Erzählens." *Unreliable Narration: Studien zur Theorie und Praxis unglaublichen Erzählens in der englischsprachigen Erzählliteratur*, Ed. Ansgar Nünning. Trier: WVT. 1998. 3-40.
- Olson, Gretta. "Reconsidering Unreliability: Fallible and Untrustworthy Narrators." *Narrative* 1 (2003): 93-109.
- O'Neill, Patrick. *Fictions of Discourse: Reading Narrative Theory*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1994.
- Palmer, Alan. *Fictional Minds*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2004.
- . *Thought and Consciousness Representation (Literature)*. London: Routledge, 2010. ProQuest, Web. 10 Mar. 2020. <<https://uaccess.univie.ac.at/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.uaccess.univie.ac.at/docview/2137943520?accountid=14682>>.
- Payne, Michael and Barbera, Jessica Rae. "Interpellation." *A Dictionary of Cultural and Critical Theory*. 2nd Ed. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Prince, Gerald. "The Disnarrated." *Style* 22 (Spring 1988): 1-8.
- . "Metanarrative Signs in Ousmane Sembène's *Les Bouts de bois de Dieu*. *Banty mam Yall*." *Narratology and Ideology: Negotiating Context, Form, and Theory in Postcolonial Narratives*. Ed. Divya Dwivedi et al. Columbus: The Ohio State UP, 2018. 93-101.

- Richardson, Brian. "Denarration in Fiction: Erasing the Story in Beckett and Others." *Narrative* 9 (2001): 168-175.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Scholes, Robert. "Metafiction." *Metafiction*. Ed. Mark Currie. London: Longman Group Ltd, 1995.
- "Trauma". *Lexico.com*. (2020). Oxford University Press, Web. 24. Jul. 2019.
<<https://www.lexico.com/definition/trauma>>.
- Utell, Janine. *Engagements with Narrative*. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Waugh, Patricia. *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*. 1984. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Yacobi, Tamar. "Package Deals in Fictional Narrative: The Case of the Narrator's (Un)Reliability." *Narrative* 9 (2001): 223-229.

7. Appendix: Plot Summaries

7.1 *All Summer*

Anna Hunt, a fugitive hiding in a rented cottage on a distant island in Ireland, writes a lengthy story to a blond man, her former lover, to whom she confesses her past misgivings and wrongdoings in order to apologize and plead to visit her. Her piece of writing entails the troublesome and uncertain journey to the island as well as Anna's employment at the stables. However, a significant part of her telling is devoted to three story-lines – the acquisition and investigation of a stolen painting and its subsequent restoration by the conservator, the platonic relationship between Anna and Kel at the hotel, and her brief affair with the blond man in the country house. The action in the narrator's second-degree account begins *in medias res* – Anna has lost her memory, awakes on a field with a briefcase full of money and a fake passport. She starts working at the farm until the night a mysterious man with long nails tries to strangle her. Recovering from the shock, Anna abandons the farm, travels to the city, and stays at a hotel where she meets another unfamiliar person (Kel) who befriends her and warns her that she is being followed. During their occasional meetings, Anna finds him very appealing, however Kel's rejections culminate on the day he invites prostitutes to his hotel room. Immediately after the sex scene Anna has spied on, she attacks Kel, injures his head, and escapes from the hotel with the thought of having committed the murder. With nowhere else to go, she returns to the stables in search of her former employer, however the mysterious man, who was following her, appears. Anna drives the car to escape the man again only to be chased after by his car. The traffic accident ensues, and Anna loses consciousness. After the collision, Anna wakes up in the blond man's house where she is looked after until the wounds heal, and her memory is rekindled. It is at this country house she realizes that the man from the hotel is her brother Kel, with whom she had committed a theft of three paintings, one of which is still missing. The blond man, with whom she develops an intimate relationship, remains caring and patient, although strangely inquisitive and persistent at times, and waits for her to recollect the location of the painting that is wanted by the police. From the moment they successfully retrieve the painting, he starts to neglect Anna, his cat, and the tended garden. Soon afterwards, Anna becomes aware of the lie that triggers a series of epiphanic moments that are revealed in the confrontation – the blond

man is actually the mysterious scavenger who tried to suffocate her at the stables and caused the traffic accident by chasing her; he is the one who corroborated with Kel in order to obtain the clues of the painting's whereabouts, and who afterwards killed him at the hotel. Furthermore, his real occupation is that of the conservator and he lied to Anna about taking her to the hospital but nurtured her in the privacy of his house in the country instead. In the aftermath of the conflict, Anna escapes by car violently, and eventually reaches her destination on the island. The novel ends with the hope that the blond man would find her cottage where they would reunite.

7.2 *The Devil I Know*

A forty-year-old translator and the thirteenth Earl of Howth, named Tristram St. Lawrence, returns to Ireland because he is summoned to give testimony in a law court concerning a speculative property business development in which he participated a decade ago. He is interrogated about the events leading to the economic crisis and all the people involved in its development, especially his business partner Desmond Hickey and Tristram's shady sponsor Monsieur Deauville, with whom he maintained a platonic friendship via the telephone conversations despite the supernatural and ominous signs. In the course of ten days, Tristram recalls the past experiences of very personal matters, such as the strained relationship with his father, a short-lived love affair with Hickey's wife, and the losing battle against alcohol addiction. He divulges those intimate events and creates a story with a tragic subplot. In Tristram's account, Monsieur Deauville poses as an evasive benefactor who admonishes him for the uncountable instrumental actions that eventually lead to his relapse into drinking. During the initial sober stage, governed by his financier, Tristram is brainwashed into believing that he is "powerless over alcohol" and becomes subservient to Monsieur Deauville's demands. He serves as an instrument, "a perfect conduit" for implementing the mastermind's plans of laundering money and allying himself with the childhood bully, Desmond Hickey, the "whoremonger" Viking, and the board of corrupt Irish politicians and officials (the Golden Circle members) in order to run up debts and further destabilize the national and the global market. As Ireland faces the aftermath of a global economic crisis, Tristram's downfall coincides with the alcohol relapse, the death of his father, and the end of the dalliance with Edel, a materialistic schemer. On top of that, the former intimate confidante, Monsieur

Deauville, whom Tristram has never met in person, turns out to be evil incarnate, who demands to settle the debt. After witnessing the horrifying devil's appearance, Tristram cowers in the basement under his castle, where he remains in a state of a prolonged shock and terror until he is discovered by the police and secured to the hospital. From this point in the story, the course of narration redirects to the main plot in which Tristram is released from court under no pressing charges. Before departing from Ireland, he decides to pay one last visit to the ruins of his castle, where he is unexpectedly accompanied by a local historian or another devil's minion, who escorts him down the stairs to hell.

8. English Abstract

Claire Kilroy's two novels, *All Summer* and *The Devil I Know*, have received considerable critical attention and much positive criticism. However, there is as yet no complete narratological study on the two works of fiction. This thesis focuses on the structure of the narratives, tries to define functions of most prominent narrative techniques and strategies, and investigates how each narrative is mediated. Findings of this research are supported by theories of many contemporary narratologists, starting from Gerard Genette, Mieke Bal, and Dorrit Cohn to Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, Monika Fludernik, and Gerald Prince. In the analysis of the novels, different aspects of the narratological approach are considered, among which reliability, narrative situation, time in narrative, focalization, metafiction, metanarration, and speech representation are most prominent. The aim of this thesis is to explore the intricate narrative devices and narratological techniques applied by Claire Kilroy, corroborating the claim that she is an unusually skillful and well informed author of narrative fiction experimenting successfully with conventional and innovative narrative patterns.

9. Deutsche Zusammenfassung

Die zwei Romane *All Summer* und *The Devil I Know* von Claire Kilroy werden beide außerordentlich von der Kritik gelobt und positiv bewertet. Zum jetzigen Zeitpunkt wurde allerdings noch keine ausführliche narratologische Untersuchung der beiden Romane unternommen. Daher beschäftigt sich diese Masterarbeit mit der Struktur der Narrative. Es wird versucht die Funktionen der prominentesten Erzähltechniken und -strategien zu definieren und zu untersuchen auf welche Weise die beiden Erzählung vermittelt werden. Die Ergebnisse dieser Forschung werden von Theorien zeitgenössischer Narratologen gestützt, von Gerard Genette, Mieke Bal, Dorrit Cohn bis zu Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, Monika Fludernik und Gerald Prince. Bei der Analyse der Romane werden verschieden Aspekte der narratologischen Untersuchung herangezogen, unter jenen die der Glaubwürdigkeit, der narrativen Situation, der Zeit im Narrativ, der Fokalisierung, der Metafiction, der Metanarration und des Erzählmodus besonders hervorzuheben sind. Ziel dieser Arbeit ist es die komplexen erzählerischen Mittel und Erzähltechniken von Claire Kilroy zu untersuchen, und damit zu bestätigen, dass sie eine ungewöhnlich kunstfertige und gut informierte Autorin ist, die in ihren Romanen erfolgreich mit konventionellen und innovativen Erzählmustern experimentiert.