Notes

I am indebted to David Herman and Liv Hausken for useful comments on a first draft of this introduction.

1. Translation by Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 20. The original reads: "La structure [d'une histoire] est indépendante des techniques qui la prennent en charge. Elle se laisse transporter de l'une à l'autre sans rien perdre de ses propriétés essentielles: le sujet d'un conte peut servir d'argument pour un ballet, celui d'un roman peut être porté à la scène ou à l'écran, on peut raconter un film à ceux qui ne l'ont pas vu. Ce sont des mots qu'on lit, ce sont des images qu'on voit, ce sont des gestes qu'on déchiffre, mais a travers eux, c'est une histoire qu'on suit, et ce peut être la même histoire."

2. An exception may be those sentences that deal exclusively with universals, such as "All men are mortal."

3. This formal characterization is developed in *A Grammar of Stories*. In his *Dictionary of Narratology* Prince proposes the following informal paraphrase: a minimal story is "a narrative recounting only two states and event such that (1) one state precedes the event in time and the event precedes the other state in time (and causes it); (2) the second state constitutes the inverse (or the modification, including the 'zero' modification) of the first." Prince's example is "John was happy, then he saw Peter, then as a result he was unhappy" (53). Prince also recognizes a minimal narrative: "A narrative representing only a single event: 'She opened the door'" (52). In a cognitivist framework, however, the difference between minimal narrative and minimal story tends to disappear, since the interpreter of "She opened the door" will rationalize the statement as a state (door closed)–event–end of state (door open) sequence. In Prince's model more complex narratives can be generated by combining minimal structures through embedding or concatenation.

4. As David Herman reminds me, comic strips and the cinema have developed some visual means to signal the lack of reality of an episode: in a comic strip, a different color frame may, for instance, indicate that the content of the picture is to be taken as merely imagined by a character; in a movie a gradual loss of focus or a trembling of the picture may lead us into an alternative possible world. But, if these devices are visual, they are not, strictly speaking, pictorial: they create an arbitrary code, similar in that respect to language, rather than expressing the lack of reality in an iconic manner.

5. For an overview of this research, see Ellen Esrock, *The Reader's Eye*, chaps. 4–5.

6. Ellen Esrock captures the dilemma in the following terms: "One can look at Monet's painting of a water lily, a visual stimulus, and process the experience either by creating a visual image of the lily, thereby using a visual code, or by assigning certain wordlike attributes to the image, such as 'oval shape, blurred edges, blue-green,' which is to use the verbal code. Similarly, these two codes can be deployed with verbal material. One can process the phrase 'a host of golden daffodils' by forming a mental image of flickering fields of light, or by forming some kind of verbal-abstract representation of word meanings pertaining to a field of yellow flowers" (96). In the case of verbal coding I would like to add: one can remember the exact words together with the meanings or store only what Esrock calls "verbal-abstract representations of word meanings." These are what I call "propositions."

7. Bordwell also suggests that there are mimetic theories of the novel and diegetic theories of cinema (3). The common advice to novelists "show, don't tell" betrays a preference for the mimetic mode, while the attempt to locate a narrator in any type of movie constitutes a diegetic approach.

8. As postulated by authors such as Metz and Chatman.

9. An example of a narrative that attributes agency to inanimate objects is this description of his field by the mathematician Keith Devlin: "Mathematicians deal with a collection of objects—numbers, triangles, groups, fields—and ask questions like, 'What is the relationship between objects x and y? If x does thus to y, what will y do back to x?' It's got plot, it's got characters, it's got relationships . . . a bit of everything you can find in a soap opera." Quoted in *Denver Post*, January 9, 2001, 2A.

10. This idea of architecture as a "narrative art" is developed by Celia Pearce, *Interactive Book*, 25–27.

11. *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary* (Springfield MA: Merriam-Webster, 1991).

12. These rules have been relaxed in the twentieth century.

13. The first number refers to the section in Aristotle's *Poetics* in which the text appears, the second to the page number of the translation from which I am quoting.

14. *Medium* is obviously a term introduced by the translator, since the root of the word is Latin and not Greek. Other translators (for example, I. Bywater in the Oxford edition) use *manner*. The Greek text, "he gar ton en heterois mimeisthai e to hetera e to heteros," tacks different endings on the word *hetera* (other) to suggest the three kinds of differences. A literal translation would read: "for [they differ] in imitating *in different things* (= medium) or *different things* = object) or *by different ways* (= mode)." The use of *medium* to translate "in different things" is consistent with a conception of medium as material support. (I am indebted to Cynthia Freeland for these clarifications.)

15. I use "Laocoön" to refer to Lessing's essay, *Laocoön* to refer to the statue, and Laocoön to refer to the Greek character.

16. Since McLuhan equates visuality with linear scanning of alphabetic characters, he is not bothered with placing media such as painting, cinema, or TV in the nonvisual category: "This is a major hang-up in all the confusion between TV and movie form, for example. TV is 'non visual' as Joyce understood from careful analysis" (letter to Donald Theall, qtd. in Theall 219).

17. The number in parentheses refers to a paragraph in Peirce's text, in conformity with the standard way to quote Peirce.

18. Cases 5, 6, 8, and 9 are the objects of a type of investigation currently practiced under the name *intermediality*. Werner Wolf provides a detailed typology of all the phenomena that fall under the scope of this concept. Wolf's concept of intermediality also cover a phenomenon that does not easily fit within Bolter and Grusin's theory of remediation: the presence of multiple semiotic and sensory channels in an artistic form.

References

Aristotle. *Poetics*. Trans. and intro. Malcolm Heath. London: Penguin Books, 1996.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulations*. Trans. Sheila Faria Glaser. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Ben-Amos, Dan. "Analytical Categories and Ethnic Genres." *Genre* 2 (1969): 275–302.

Bolter, Jay David, and Richard Grusin. *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999.

Bordwell, David. *Narrative in the Fiction Film*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Bordwell, David, and Kristin Thompson. *Film Art*. 3d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990.

Bremond, Claude. *Logique du récit*. Paris: Seuil, 1973.

Brooks, Peter. *Reading for the Plot*. New York: Random House, 1984.

Bruner, Jerome. *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.

———. *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Esrock, Ellen. *The Reader's Eye: Visual Imaging as Reader Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Fludernik, Monika. "Genres, Text Types, or Discourse Modes? Narrative Modalities and Generic Categorization." *Style* 34.2 (2000): 274–92.

Gibson, J. J. "The Theory of Affordances." *Perceiving, Acting, and Knowing*. Ed. R. E. Shaw and J. Bransford. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977.

Herman, David. "Parables of Narrative Imagining." *Diacritics* 29.1 (1999): 20–36.

———. *Story Logic*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002.

Innis, Harold A. *Empire of Communications*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

Johnston, John. *Information Multiplicity: American Fiction in the Age of Media Saturation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Kittler, Friedrich A. *Literature, Media, Information Systems*. Ed. John Johnston. Amsterdam: G+B Arts, 1997.

Labov, William. *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. *Laocoön: An Essay on the Limits of Painting and Poetry*. Trans. and intro. Edward Allen McCormick. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.

McLuhan, Marshall. *Essential McLuhan*. Ed. Eric McLuhan and Frank Zingrone. New York: Basic Books, 1996.

McLuhan, Marshall, and Bruce R. Powers. *The Global Village: Transformations in World Life and Media in the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Metz, Christian. *Film Language. A Semiotics of the Cinema*. Trans. Michael Taylor. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Meyrowitz, Joshua. "Medium Theory." *Communication Theory Today*. Ed. David Crowley and David Mitchell. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, 1994. 50–77.

Murray, Janet. *Hamlet on the Holodeck: The Future of Narrative in Cyberspace*. New York: Free Press, 1997.

Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Methuen, 1982.

Pearce, Celia. *The Interactive Book: A Guide to the Interactive Revolution*. Indianapolis: Macmillan Technical Publishing, 1997.

Peirce, Charles Sanders. *Collected Papers*. Vol. 3. Ed. C. Hartshorn, P. Weiss and A. W. Burkes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931–58.

Prince, Gerald. *A Grammar of Stories*. The Hague: Mouton, 1973.

———. *Dictionary of Narratology*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987.

Richardson, Brian. "Recent Concepts of Narrative and the Narratives of Narrative Theory." *Style* 34.2 (2000): 168–75.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Temps et récit*. 3 vols. Paris: Seuil, 1983, 1984, 1985.

Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. "How the Model Neglects the Medium: Linguistics, Language, and the Crisis of Narratology." *Journal of Narrative Technique* 19.1 (1989): 157–66.

Searle, John. *Speech Acts*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

———. "The Logical Status of Fictional Discourse." *New Literary History* 6 (1975): 319–32.

Smith, Barbara Herrnstein. "Narrative Versions, Narrative Theories." *On Narrative*. Ed. W. J. T. Mitchell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981. 209–32.

Sturgess, Philip J. M. *Narrativity: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Talmy, Leonard. "A Cognitive Framework for Narrative Structure." *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000. 2:417–82.

Theall, Donald. *Beyond the Word: Reconstructing Sense in the Joyce Era of Technology, Culture, and Communications*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995.

————. *The Virtual Marshall McLuhan*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001.

Turner, Mark. *The Literary Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Virtanen, Tuija. "Issues of Text Typology: Narrative—A 'Basic' Type of Text? *Text* 12.2 (1992): 293–310.

Wolf, Werner. *The Musicalization of Fiction: A Study in the Theory and History of Intermediality*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999.

Worth, Sol. "Pictures Can't Say Ain't." *Studies in Visual Communication*. Ed. and intro. Larry Gross. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.

Wutz, Michael, and Joseph Tabbi. *Reading Matters: Narrative in the New Media Ecology*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.

1. Face-to-Face Narration

Face-to-face narration: the phrase is almost, but not entirely, synonymous with oral storytelling. With the invention of the telephone, radio, and television, modern technology has dissociated orality from co-presence. Most of Walter Ong's channels of secondary orality lack the live interaction between the narrator and the audience that we find in the primary type. The label "oral narrative" is therefore insufficient to capture two essential properties of face-to-face narration. The first of these properties is interactivity. It is current these days to extol the interactive narrativity of digital media, but no amount of hyperlinking can match the oral narrator's freedom to adapt his tale to the particular needs of the audience. In a conversational context the text is not delivered ready-made to the recipient but is dynamically and dialogically constructed in the real time of the storytelling event, as the narrator responds to diverse types of input: questions from the audience, interruptions, requests for explanations, laughter, supportive vocalizations, and facial expressions. The same fluidity characterizes the relation between the narrator and the audience. Since face-to-face interaction constantly renegotiates the role of the participants, every listener is, at least in principle, a potential storyteller. The second distinctive property is the multi-channel dimension of what McLuhan called in *The Global Village* (1989) (somewhat reductively) "acoustic space": face-to-face storytelling is more than a purely mental experience of language based on syntax and semantics; it is also a corporeal performance in which meaning is created through gestures, facial expressions, and intonation. The telephone may share the interactivity of face-to-face storytelling, and television may emulate the diversity of its channels, but only face-to-face narration presents both properties.

Early narratology—the body of work associated with the names of Genette, Todorov, Barthes, Greimas, Lévi-Strauss, and Propp—was too focused on the idea of narrative as a synchronic structure to pay much attention to the dynamics of its emergence from a conversational context.

Contents

Acknowledgments