"*To Kill a Mockingbird*: A Tale of Voices"

By Valentina Prieto Torres

Paper submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree in

English Philology and Languages

DIRECTOR:

Professor Norma Ojeda

Author's note

Valentina Prieto Torres, Foreign Languages Department,

National University of Colombia, Bogotá.

E-mail: vprietot@unal.edu.co/vprietotorres@gmail.com

February 14, 2022

Abstract

This study aims to interpret *To Kill a Mockingbird* through its complex double narrative voice to reveal how this choice of narrator influenced the creation of the novel. *TKaM* tells the story of a woman, Jean Louise Finch, who is reminiscing about a couple of eventful years in her childhood in 1930s Alabama, which included the trial of Tom Robinson, a black man accused of the rape of a white woman whom her father, attorney Atticus Finch, is defending. The author chooses to split the narrative voice in two layers: first, her adult self who is narrating these memories, and second, her seven-year-old self who lived through these events. These creative decisions determine the aesthetic object in terms of the creation of the setting, which is a cross historical montage between the early 1930s and the mid-1950s in the United States that allows critical commentary about the early Civil Rights era to be framed in a nostalgic ambiance, and the perspective of the protagonist-narrator who is at the same time a child and an adult, which results in a point of view that is both innocent and analytical. Through Gerard Genette's concepts of narrative person and narrative time, and Mikhail Bakhtin's ideas of content and aesthetic object, this complex narrative voice is broken down and analysed in detail, while noting the way that it influences the story telling, and revealing the white power consciousness and antiracism ideologies that the author is putting forth in her novel.

Key words: narrative voice, analepsis, aesthetic object, content, childhood, evaluative stand.

Resumen

Este estudio pretende interpretar *To Kill a Mockingbird* (*Matar un ruiseñor*) a través de su doble voz narrativa compleja para revelar cómo esta elección de narrador influyó en la creación de la novela. *TKaM* cuenta la historia de una mujer, Jean Louise Finch, que está recordando un par de años agitados de su niñez en la década de 1930 en Alabama, que incluyeron el juicio de Tom Robinson, un hombre negro acusado de la violación de una mujer blanca a quien su padre, el abogado Atticus Finch, defiende. La autora decide separar la voz narrativa en dos capas: primero, su yo adulto que narra estas memorias, y segundo, su yo de siete años que vivió estos eventos. Estas decisiones creativas determinan el objeto estético en cuanto a la creación del escenario, que es un montaje histórico cruzado entre principios de la década de 1930 y mediados de la década de 1950 en Estados Unidos lo cual permite que el comentario crítico sobre la era temprana de los Derechos Civiles se enmarque en un ambiente nostálgico, y la perspectiva de la protagonista-narradora quien es al mismo tiempo una niña y una adulta, resultando en un punto de vista inocente y analítico a la vez. A través de los conceptos de persona narrativa y tiempo narrativo de Gerard Genette, y las ideas del contenido y el objeto estético de Miajíl Bajtín, esta compleja voz narrativa se desglosa y analiza en detalle, mientras se apunta la manera cómo influye en la narración, y se revelan las ideologías del poder blanco y el antirracismo que la autora propone en su novela.

Palabras clave: voz narrativa, analepsis, objeto estético, contenido, niñez, posición evaluativa.

Table of contents

Introduction

The present paper is a study of the narrative voice in Harper Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird* and the consequences this construction has in the way the story telling. To be able to reach the objectives, the paper presents three theoretical bases: narratology, content, and childhood. The first refers to the ideas proposed in Gerard Genette's *Narrative Discourse* which is the main theoretical perspective to analyse the form of the novel, specifically, the structure of the narrative voice. The second tackles the theoretical tenets Mikhail Bakhtin proposes in his article "The problem of the Content, the Material, and the Form" to describe and understand the relationship between the novel and the real life historical, political, and social surroundings of its origin and the form the novel acquires. The third is an exploration of the concept of childhood, which approaches some of its most influential explanations chronologically, building a working definition used. These three theoretical approaches are the argumentation axes of analysis and interpretation.

Upon establishing this theoretical backbone, the novel is approached from each one of the perspectives. Separated in three chapters, the body of the work explores how these ideas are used in the novel, explaining their different functions by means of examples. The first chapter is based on Genette's narrative time and narrative person to create the form of the novel; the way that the two components of the narrative voice are placed and used, and the timeline that is created because of this separation of the past and the present are explained in detail. This chapter establishes that the double nature of the narrator is imperative to understand the novel. The second chapter describes the historical, social, political and cultural circumstances of two time periods in the United States' Deep South, the early 1930s, the Great Depression, and the second half of the 1950s, the early Civil Rights Movement. These two indicate the time period when the novel is set and the time period when it was created respectively, and they are approached in order to understand the cognitive instances: the real-life events, the author isolates for aestehtisation by ethical assessment to become the content of the novel. The third chapter explores the form established in the first and the content established in the second in their interaction, highlighting through examples in the novel how the two relate and integrate, specifically in the way the setting is built, and the way the novel proposes thewhite power consciousness and antiracist ideological perspective of the narrator-character Jean Louise "Scout" Finch, an extradiegetic-metadiegetic narrator who is telling a story about memories of racial discrimination and injustice.

By means of this exploration, this paper aims not only to uncover the inner workings of the novel's form and content, but also to be able to give the readers a new perspective to read the novel with. With a seemingly straightforward and simple structure, *TKaM* can be overseen as a story of a girl who is placed in circumstances that are included as add-ons that lead to difficult conversations about prejudice, and in part, it is, but the way in which Harper Lee decided to organise and weave the story prove to be much more interesting to explore. The displaced narrative voice, the cross historical setting, the depiction of Boo Radley and Atticus, are all decisions that, when looked at in detail, reveal many layers of the novel that are not easily perceived. The knowledge of these complex systems can provide an in-depth pleasurable reading experience, which leads to new and more profound questions.

Justification

To Kill a Mockingbird by Harper Lee is a very well-regarded novel, widely recognised for its narrative techniques, the themes it deals with, and especially the way the writer depicts them through her main character, Scout. The events the audience is presented with are seen through her eyes, building an atmosphere of child-like understanding that changes the ways said themes develop throughout the novel. Racial injustice, for example, is a central topic of the novel, and due to the fact that the narrator is a child, it is presented with a naivety that lets readers live it from an absolutely different perspective. From the first page, the novel draws the reader's attention. At the beginning, a narrator is introduced very clearly, and it is shocking that for a theme as complex and as controversial, the writer would choose the perspective of a young girl to tell it. This is one of those novels that are satisfying to read, all the way through and, at the same time, leaves a taste of discomfort, because it shows a reality that the world seems to have forgotten: for some, race defines the rights the characters should be acknowledged with.

Initially, the most outstanding topic is racial injustice; it creates a long-lasting impression and the one most frequently considered when the novel is approached from a literary critic's point of view. It is definitely the topic that tugs at the reader's heart strings the most, and the one that provokes most reminiscing thoughts. The impression changes when the novel is approached a second time. Scout, the narrator, talks about several topics that include gender roles, education and discrimination, which are not that noticeable the first time. Even though racial prejudice is the *leitmotif*, the point of view from which it is told is much richer, like a wide lens that can show many other discriminatory attitudes and situations that could be underappreciated, being labelled as simply, "background". Thus, the author's criticism is multi-layered, the most prominent one being hope. Investing so much in a character like Scout, who is a young girl living a young girl's life, provides a view of a hateful world with incomprehensible reasons behind all that hate. The narrator's innocent point of view contrasts with the harsh truths around her, which provides an outlook that deliberately tries to find the light in all this darkness, hope in the midst of all the hatred.

This layer of hope is very unstable, however, and it is closely followed by sadness and frustration. The first time around, hope is the only recognisable layer in Scout's escapades with Jem and Dill, and her child-like optimism. Then, Tom Robinson's trial and his tragic destiny bring forth the

subsequent gloomy layers. All of the layers described are foreshadowed. This is what creates the momentary feeling of hope, but it is instantly followed by sadness and frustration caused by the blue realisations of the unfair world the characters are immersed in.

Both of these upsetting feelings or layers arise constantly throughout the novel. They are so shocking that sadness turns into frustration, and frustration morphs into an angry response. The root of this explosive response is the idea that in this fictional town, children are the ones to recognize the accepted notions that are so clearly favouring the power group: white people. With only a couple of exceptions, the main adults in this town seem to have no consciousness; they are only hollow "righteous" characters. The whole idea that there is no challenging of the norm, no critical perspective of the blatantly obvious discrimination leads to rage. This plays along with hope, because it is depicted in terms of a new generation with a conscious standpoint towards these discriminatory practices, but they were incapable of doing anything about it, which also leads to anger. The young ones questioned these injustices, but because of their age, they were not listened to. The ones that had power and the opportunity to make a change, were not the ones who were asking the questions. That is the reason why Atticus is such a beloved character. Not only is he a wonderful portrayal of courage, but a well-rounded character that feels like a breath of fresh air in the dense ambiance of Alabama.

This pattern of hope-sadness-frustration-rage repeats itself when approaching the other topics that are touched upon in the novel. Gender roles are pointed at several times. Scout is a seven-year-old girl and her brother, Jem, is 12. Naturally, she acts upon his example. However, the older ladies in Maycomb describe her ways as "not lady-like", and tell her that her behaviour is not well regarded. Often, they tell her than this "boyish" attitude will get her nowhere, because no man would ever want to marry her. The indifference of a community towards violence is impersonated in Arthur "Boo" Radley. He is a young ex-felon who is clearly damaged by his father's attitude towards him; his decision is to lock him up in the house and preventing him from going to a mental institution. The townspeople could not care less about this situation, to the point that the only ones interested in him are the kids. How Scout's school teacher nags her about reading with her father, because whatever was taught outside school was wrong, is a glimpse of the educational system and the role it played in 1930's Maycomb County. At first, these situations seem as if they were just part of the setting, but taking into account that Scout's childhood scenarios —which make up more than half

of the novel— have nothing to do with Tom Robinson's trial, it is certain that they are much more meaningful.

TKaM depicts a world where systemic injustice is looked over and any attempt at trying to fix it is considered mad. In the fictional Maycomb of the 1930s, the young Scout is hopeful, but she is also sad, confused, frustrated and angry about what is revealed to her regarding her community as a result of Tom Robinson's trial. Racial injustice, gender roles, and violence against minorities were issues in her fictional 1930s setting, and the author presents these harsh truths in her novel through the eyes of someone who is able to recognise the failures of her surroundings, and question the foundations of the social and cultural context she is growing up in. By doing so, *TKaM* is no longer just a story, but a critique of a set of values that determined the way the systems depicted in Maycomb worked, where a kind young man is rejected because of unfounded judgement, where a fatal destiny is the only conclusion for an accused black man even though he is innocent, and where a young girl seems to develop the most awareness about these injustices than any other character can.

Objectives

All of these perceptions build the basis for an interpretation of the novel in a very specific light. As stated above, the main character of the novel is a seven-year-old girl, Jean Louise "Scout" Finch. However, she is not the only narrator. The whole novel is a much older Jean Louise reminiscing the events that she witnessed when she was a child. This makes the narrative voice much more complex, and, consequently, the depiction of Maycomb and its characters cannot be interpreted just as a child's perspective of the world. So then, the question of the narrator becomes much more interesting. This study attempts to describe the narrative voice construction in detail to be able to understand how the aesthetic object was created, revealing the way that the form and the content work together to put forth the author's ideological perspective.

Main Objective

To interpret *To Kill a Mockingbird* through a detailed analysis of the narrative voice structure and the consequences of its perspective in an attempt to reveal the author's critical commentary on racial injustice and discrimination.

Specific objectives

- To define the notion of narrator based on Gerard Genette's narratology.
- To identify and define the construction of the double narrator in the novel.
- To identify the moments in which the older Jean Louise is evident in the narration and analyse why she is interjecting.
- To describe the socio-cultural context presented in the novel and identify how it is transformed into the novel's content.
- To discuss the effects the narrative voice has on the setting construction and character depictions.
- To describe the way the form and the content work together in the aesthetic object.

Limitations of study

To be able to define the narrative voice, both the child and adult parts that it includes, psychological and philosophical postulates are going to be the main theoretical sources. The concept of childhood is going to be used in this paper, and its working definition will be referenced from the most relevant proposals of these theoretical approaches. However, references to the sociological nature of the concept are going to be addressed when relevant. Also, the context will be very important to adequately frame the way the narration works; the notion of a white woman reminiscing about her childhood in the Deep South in 1930 has very specific connotations that will be addressed.

The character studied in depth is Jean Louise "Scout" Finch. She will be studied as a character and as a narrator, both in the instances where she projects a child's voice, as well as the ones where she uses her adult self. The concepts used and defined are expressed only through her experiences. The idea of this whole paper is to understand the way the narrative voice is constructed and how it works in the novel, so approaching only Jean Louise's point of view is imperative. Other characters that are shown are going to be discussed on the basis of how the narrator is depicting them, allowing the analysis to have clear examples of the effects of the narrator. This means that the other characters will serve as visible effects of the narrative voice, and further analysis of them will not be part of this work.

State of the Art

TKaM has been a topic of academic debate since its publication and subsequent success, being subject to various approaches and critical readings. Published articles on the novel include debates about the work's academic and literary value, its recurrent themes of racism, gender roles, and the 'coming of age' trope (Murray, 2010, p. 75), its depiction of the Deep South in the 1930s, and its construction of black and white characters. The novel has had a remarkable impact, so much so that studies about it have gone far off from literature, with authors producing papers on education theory, history and even cross-examination in court —due to Atticus Finch's performance in the trial portrayed in the novel. The following corpus focuses on the field of literature and includes fairly recent work on *TKaM*, as well as its companion sequel —or original draft— *Go Set a Watchman*, whose publication in 2015 inspired a new wave of studies about the first novel and provided new elements for its analysis.

One of the themes that is most often addressed when tackling *TKaM* is racism. The racial tensions in the Deep South during the Depression era are the backdrop of the story that the novel tells. The warm and calm world of the child protagonist is shaken up because of these tensions, and is the case of a black man, Tom Robinson, that constitutes the dramatic axis of the novel. Due to the integration of the theme of race-based injustice, *TKaM* has been praised in the past, specially at the time of its publication in 1960, since the civil rights movement was in full-fledged force by that time. However, the author's depiction of this problematic has much more depth to it than just applause. The illustration of black individuals in the novel is one of the issues critics have shone light on, since it seems that the author, as a white woman, is depicting an imagined past in which black people were oppressed, but did not do anything about it until a white person took agency and defended them (Saney in Bloom, 2010, p. 62). This position is not uncommon and has put into doubt the pedestal in which audiences have placed the character of Atticus Finch as an exemplary paragon of racial justice, thus putting in question handling of racism in the whole novel. Harper Lee has been accused of calling out racism in a superficial manner, by pointing out that excessive violence against black people is wrong, but not touching upon the social system that makes those violent actions possible (Saney in Bloom, 2010, p. 61).

This lack of a strong and radical position towards the systematicity of racism in the United States is argued to be a reason why the novel is so popular, specially liked in school curriculums that set out to teach children and young adults about prejudice. The figure of Atticus Finch being honoured by the black attendees in the trial portion of the novel supports the thesis that *TKaM* became —and still is— so popular because of the figure of the white saviour alluded to above. Naa Baako Ako-Adjei highlights that the white audience that reads the book relate not to Tom Robinson's struggle, but to the idea that they can be the Atticus that defends him (2017, p. 185). In the same article, Ako-Adjei points out that the way Harper Lee tackles racial problematics in the novel is detrimental to the historical view of white United States citizens, profiling the problem of racism only to poor whites —the character of Bob Ewell being its prototype— which perpetrates the idea that "racism in the United States wasn't really about the systematic use of terror, or the threat of terror, on black people in order to maintain white supremacy, but that racism and racist violence were perpetrated by a negligible number of Americans […]"(2017, p. 185). The iconic novel is challenged in this article, which criticises the way in which the author decided to write the past, seemingly undermining a racist system under the myth of the 'good whites' and the innocence of the narrative voice (2017, pp. 198, 200).

The 1930s that are constructed in *TKaM* have been subjected to further revision, and a romanticised version of them is a common conclusion. What Ako-Adjei was denouncing in her paper has been traced by others to the cross-historical montage that serves as setting for the novel. Harper Lee wrote the book in the mid-1950s, while the civil rights movement was growing wider and stronger, and by the same token, racial violence at the hands of white people was increasing as well. In 1955, a 14-year-old African-American boy, Emmett Till, was lynched in Mississippi by two white men for allegedly making sexual advances on a white woman. Critics find this event to be the blueprint for Tom Robinson's case (Chura in Bloom, 2010, p. 49). In Maycomb's 1930s setting, the author is projecting the concerns and issues that were brought into public and massive discourse by the civil rights movement, which were very much predominant in the context of creation of the novel. This is why the setting was described as a cross-historical montage before; it is a mixture of an imagined childhood in the 1930s and an inescapable reality in the 1950s, which has been suggested as a method by which the author is "working out complex issues of conscience and subjectivity suggested by the Till case and the civil rights movement in general" (Chura in Bloom, 2010, p. 54). Therefore, the historical background that is presented in *TKaM* is much more a way for the author

to be able to understand her own time, than it is a realistic rendition of the period in which the story takes place.

The second part of Ako-Adjei's criticism —the innocence of the narrative voice— has also been a subject of several studies, and it has recently shown more interest from academics, since the publication of *Go Set a Watchman* shines light on the importance of Scout's voice being the one that tells the previous story. However, before the publication of the second novel, there was debate around the labelling of *TKaM* as a Bildungsroman, since for some, the development of Scout's character is not as evident or well supported to be considered this type of 'coming of age' story. They argue that the change that the character goes through is not as deep-seated as to be considered radical, and thus, it does not show the journey from childhood to adolescence —which is what Bildungsroman is characterised by (Murray, 2010, p. 80). Nonetheless, the novel is still considered a coming of age story, but not for Scout. Jem is a little older than Scout, and his experience during Tom Robinson's trial does signal a process of maturing, one that forces him to reconsider and reorganise his way of thinking, and his place as a white man in his community. (Murray, 2010, p. 81; Pond, 2017, p. 88). Other academic productions have supported the opposite side of the debate, not only cataloguing Scout's journey as Bildungsroman, but a feminist Bildungsroman. This standpoint discusses that, as the young girl struggles with the newfound dynamics of her community, the reality of her place as a white woman dawns on her and, by the end of the novel, she becomes aware of the role her identity plays in the world of Maycomb (Ware in Bloom, 2010, p. 66).

After the release of the sequel in 2015, criticism washed over the long-awaited novel. Admirers of *TKaM* were absolutely baffled, feeling betrayed and angry about the second coming of Harper Lee. The glorified image of Atticus Finch was slowly torn down as the second book takes audiences back to Maycomb, only to find out that the impeccable lawyer is leading a Citizen Council abiding for keeping Alabama's segregation laws intact —basically leading a racist group. Critics argued that the general public's negative response to *Go Set a Watchman* had to do with the fact that the innocence that the child narrator provided in the first novel was now nowhere to be found, and readers had to come to terms with a reality that was far bleaker than what Scout had showed them (Henninger, 2016 ; Eaton, 2017; Pond, 2017). What readers experienced was a great disillusionment. This was not only due to the innocence that young Scout expressed through her

voice, but the way that her eyes took in the world of Maycomb. In *TKaM*, Scout is getting to know her community and herself through understanding the dynamics of similarities and oppositions between different types of people. She groups herself with Jem, Atticus and her Aunt Alexandra; Tom Robison, Calpurnia, Bob Ewell and Walter Cunningham belong to different sections of her reality. Through this organisation of her small town, Scout starts making judgements of herself over the way she is similar to the people that are in her group, and dissimilar to the people that are not (Best, 2009, p. 543). Her eventual understanding of that which is deemed as different in 'the other' constitutes her development, and her newfound place in her community (Best, 2009, p. 551). This becomes problematic when a much older Jean Louise goes back to the small town, because the notions she had of 'the other' and how they are supposed to behave —as well as the way the people from her own group are supposed to behave— seemed to have been biased (Henninger, 2016, p. 620)

Critics discuss that in *Go Set a Watchman*, Jean Louise has to confront the people and the community she grew up with, reflecting on who they really were and the way she had constructed them in her younger imagery. She comes back to realise that that racial innocence that was mentioned before, the one that moved and made the first novel so popular, was her way of shaping a world that was much more complex. Jean Louise, as a white child, simplified her surroundings and carried this idea of her past through adulthood (Henninger, 2016, p. 612). The deconstruction of this limited perspective is evident not only in the tone of *Go Set a Watchman*, but in the configuration of the narrative voice. The novel is presented by a third-person omniscient narrator, who focalises certain parts of the story in the minds of Jean Louise, Atticus or Hank —Jean Louise's boyfriend— removing the single focus that *TKaM* had. This way, the second novel provides multiple perspectives that complicate the setting and dynamics of the new Maycomb (Pond, 2017, p. 90). The critics that have studied both novels, and focusing on the narrative voice, have reached similar conclusions. Part of the success of *TKaM* is due to its narrator being —for most of the novel— a child. The very heavy and complex situations that the novel presents are simplified through the use of that particular voice, making the story much more pleasant to read. In *Go Set a Watchman*, this voice does not dominate the story, which brings up those same complex issues without anything to water them down, forcing Jean Louise —and the reader—to realise and confront her childhood naivety (Eaton, 2017, p. 349; Henninger, 2016, p. 618; Pond, 2017, p. 98).

Another approach that has been studied in terms of the narrator —and, subsequently, the depiction of the characters from a single perspective— is the way the novel was adapted into film. Dean Shackelford compared the two narrative perspectives, discussing how the changing from a first-person perspective in the pages to a third-person camera, displaces audience's attention. As mentioned before, some critics have concluded that the novel's success and recognition rest, for the most part, in the childlike perspective that the reader can immerse him or herself into. When this perspective is changed —as in the case of *Go Set a Watchman*— the ambiance of childhood disappears, leaving space for the adults to take over. This is Shackelford's position in terms of the film adaptation: it left behind Scout's perspective and traded it for an objective narrator, causing the movie to be much more focused on the 'adult' parts of the story, like Atticus's role and Tom Robinson's trial (1996, p. 101). This also affected another dimension of the first-person character that is pivotal in the novel. The fact that Scout is a girl and is expected to act like one, especially since she is growing up, flavours her entire perspective of the world she is surrounded by, as well as the things she finds important and wants to talk about. In the novel, this is made clear by the many times her attitude or clothes are criticised as not being 'feminine enough', bringing to the forefront her issues with gender identity and expression. However, Shackelford finds that this is lost in the film, because moments that are constructed from a gendered lens in the novel are not completely translated in the movie where the perspective is omniscient, leaving them unexplained and out of context (1996, pp. 105, 106). Nonetheless, not all critics that have approached the adaptation agree with Shackelford. Robert Armstrong signalled the ways in which the film tries to evoke Scout's perspective. Through camera angles —tilted up to make it seem like the audience is shorter than other characters— and the use of light and music —gloomy and scary in scenes that focus on Bob Ewell— the film is attempting to reproduce Scout's perspective in the language of film (in Bloom, 2010, pp. 66, 67, 69). Even though Armstrong does not discuss the narrative changes in the film, he does pose questions that suggest a critical view about the racial implications of both the book and the movie, challenging readers to reflect on the material:

> Seeing the film from an early-21th-century perspective, what do you think of a white lawyer defending an African-American victim of racial hatred whilst keeping an African-American maid? How would an audience in America in 1962 have read this? How do you think contemporary Africa-Americans would have responded to that scene in which black people in the gallery rise in tribute to Gregory Peck's white lawyer defending their rights? (2010, p. 70)

The works that have been discussed showcase the broad influence *TKaM* has had in academic production. While some are much closer to the purpose of this paper —and are going to be further referenced— the whole picture presented serves as a way to understand the multiple approaches the novel has elicited, as well as the conversations that can be constructed amidst the variety of points of view in the academic context. Since this study aims to deconstruct the narrative voice and its effects on the creation of the novel, the investigations by Karly Eaton, Katherine Henninger and Julia Pond are going to be particularly important. However, clarification is necessary before this particular analysis takes place. To be able to study and interpret the novel, it is imperative to understand the concepts that build the basis for this research.

Theoretical Framework

Narratology

In 1979, Gérard Genette published *Narrative Discourse*, a thorough study of the narrative method and its intricacies. Through his analysis of Marcel Proust's series of novels *In Search of Lost Time*, Genette established three main concepts that he considers the basis of a functional narrative system: narrative time, narrative mood, and narrative voice. Because of the kind of narrator Jean Louise Finch is and the way the novel is organised, and of course, the focus of this paper, the concepts regarded here are narrative time and narrative voice.

Narrative time is the first part of Genette's analysis and the most extensive one. He divides it in three sections: order, frequency, and duration. The idea of analepsis, which Genette describes as "any evocation after the fact of an event that took place earlier that the point of the story where we are at any given moment." (Genette, 1980, p. 40) is the first concept he approaches. Using Proust's novels, Genette describes the use of this form of narrative order, stating that any decision of altering a regular chronological progression in a narrative structure is worth analysing. Whenever an analepsis is constructed in a narration, the past and the present enter in a relationship of anachrony, in which the narrative voice is made more complex by the separation of perspective towards the event in question. The idea of memory is a very good example and it works to clarify what seems complicated in Genette's concept. It is very different to describe an event that is taking place in the present than a memory from an experience that took place ten years prior, because the perspective of whoever is narrating in the first case does not know how that experience will affect them in the future, but the narrator in the second case does. This is what creates the relationship of anachrony, because when the second narrator —from the previous example— retells the event, it does not keep their fidelity of the actual experience. What that narrator communicates are parts of that event that they —consciously or not— consider relevant, presented in the light that they think appropriate depending on the consequences of that experience, which they already know of because it already happened to them. If the reader knows of the series of novels Genette was working with, then they will understand that the concept of analepsis was fundamental for his analysis. Proust's work in his series of novels uses this technique to create an incredibly complex narrative voice in various

anachronic relations at the same time. However, as referenced before, Genette's definition is generalised, and it works for any event narrated that happened in a prior time.

The last category Genette delves into is the narrative voice. The first concept that is relevant to understand is one he calls subsequent narrating. For Genette, the first step to be able to dissect a narrative voice is to understand that the narrative instance is a separate phenomenon from the story, and that whatever perspective the author chooses for the narrator has to be understood in a temporal relationship with the specific point in time the story is in. The subsequent narration is one of four possibilities for that temporal relationship between narrative perspective and story. The other three are labelled as prior, simultaneous and interpolated narration. For Genette, subsequent means a story that is positioned behind regarding the place of the narrating instance; a story told in the past tense (1980, p. 220). It also means this kind of narrative placing has a very flexible relationship regarding the duration of the story, because in order for it to work, it does not have to indicate the interval of time which separates the narrating from the story, a characteristic that the other types do not share. The example of a memory that was used before works for this concept as well. A whole novel can be constructed around, for example, an old man recounting his young years, without it being necessary for the reader to know how long it took for the man to tell his story. The instance of narrating is atemporal, with no need for a regular progressive movement. So, for Genette, subsequent narrating exists in a paradox: "[…] it possesses at the same time a temporal situation (with respect to the past story) and an atemporal essence (since it has no duration proper)." (1980, p. 223). This concept, along with analepsis, defines the temporal background for the narrator, the narrating instance, and the story, and it is important to consider it because, as stated before, it can absolutely change the interpretation of a literary work.

Evidently, these types of constructions —where a story is temporally displaced from the narrative instance— create a certain hierarchy of storytelling. Genette recognises this organisation in the form of narrative levels, where he labels each of the narrative recounts in a succession of degrees. For him there is an imperative to differentiate between these levels: any event that is presented in the form of a recounting in a particular narrative is one level above the act of narration of said narrative (Genette, 1980, p. 228). So, labelling the old man retelling his memories in the previous example would be the following: the old man's present would be the first degree, while the events of the memories he is telling in the past tense would be the second degree. This kind of narrative

structure can have several degrees acting as layers in the story, with the imperative being fully functional with as many levels as the author decides to construct. This means that, for example, if there were a letter in a specific memory of the old man, a letter that described a time before the one of the memory itself, that letter would constitute a third degree inside the two others. Each of these levels or degrees is named depending on the relationship they have with the story —focalised as the main narration— so that a first degree narration is labelled extradiegetic and a second degree narration as intradiegetic or metadiegetic (Genette, 1980, p. 229). The comprehension of the construction and application of this narrative hierarchy helps track the narrative perspective in a timeline, making it easier to dissect the voice. It is important to clarify that when this concept is referred to as a hierarchy, it is only because of the subordination figure it makes with each added degree; it has nothing to do with the importance of the narrative levels, since every part of the narrative structure serves an important function —it would not be there if that were not the case.

Before moving on, there is a concept Genette devises in order to describe the way Proust's novels are organised in terms of narrative degrees. He has already established the extradiegetic and metadiegetic levels, but they both seem too restrictive to be able to talk about what Proust does, so Genette decides to use the term 'pseudo-diegetic': "[…] a narrative second in its origin is immediately brought to the first level and taken charge of, whatever its source might be, by the narrator-hero." (1980, p. 241). What this term encompasses is the idea that the narrative levels are dynamic and that they can be transformed during the narration. For Genette, Proust deliberately charges his second degree narrative with such a force that it overtakes the first narrator, constructing the whole structure on a pseudo-diegetic analepsis. However, the essay includes another concept to differentiate between an absolute change of focalisation and a transgression of narrative levels, which he names 'metalepses' (Genette, 1980, p. 235) The example used before is again enlightening. If the old man who began telling his memories is overturned by the force of the memories themselves, and the narrative voice is witness to this force, the narration goes from extradiegetic to pseudo-diegetic, with the second degree taking over. However, if the extradiegetic narrator emerges with no narrative indication in the second degree, or vice versa, but the focalisation has not changed —the voice in charge is still placed at its original level—what happens is a transgression of levels, a metalepses. While the first seems like a natural transition, the second seems like an intrusion. Whether or not these narrative decisions are deliberate, they have significant consequences in the way the work is read.

Now, after dissecting the temporal disposition and the layers of the narrative voice, Genette dives into the narrative person. This topic comprises what is widely known as either first, second, or third person narrative. Genette focuses on first person, as this is the one Proust wrote in. He finds a great complexity in the term 'first person narrative' because he argues it is too general to be able to be applied in a way that actually helps to interpret a literary work. He proceeds to divide this class into subgroups that go into more detail about the use of the perspective. The first division is between the heterodiegetic and the homodiegetic narrative person. The first is a type of narrative in which the narrator is absent from the story he or she is telling, like Homer in the *Iliad*; the second type has a narrator present as a character in the story, like Offred in *The Handmaid's Tale* (Genette, 1980, p. 244). This second subgroup is again divided by Genette, because as he states "Absence is absolute, but presence has degrees" (p. 245). So, inside the homodiegetic narrative he defines two types: the one where the narrator is the hero of the story and the one where the narrator plays a secondary role. In *The Handmaid's Tale* there would be a narrative voice of the first type, because Offred is the heroine in her story; the whole catalogue of *Sherlock Holmes* would constitute the second type, as doctor Watson is one of the most famous companions in literature, and as a witness, he tells the story of Sherlock, the hero. The first type, which Genette finds to be the most frequent use of the homodiegetic narrator, is labelled autodiegetic.

For Genette, these last two categories, narrative level and narrative person, constitute the main characteristics to define the narrator's status. The different combinations of both aspects build four main types of narrator which are likely to appear in a narrative with a first person perspective. First, the combination extradiegetic-heterodiegetic is the case of a first level narrator who tells a story they are absent from; second, the combination extradiegetic-homodiegetic is a narrator on the first level as well, but who tells their own story; third, the combination intradiegetic-heterodiegetic is a second degree narrator who tells stories their absent from; and the fourth combination intradiegetic-homodiegetic, a narrator in the second level who tells their own story. By offering four general combinations, Genette makes it much easier to have a place to start in the analysis of a narrative voice. Locating a narrative work in one of these four categories answers many of the main questions that can arise when identifying the voice, and it serves as a compass to go back to in case the voice gets mixed up during the storytelling process. Due to the complexity of the voice Genette was working with, he refers to interjections of an omniscient third person perspective that have certain effects in the novels.

In Search of Lost Time is a series of novels that fit —somewhat loosely— in the second paradigm of Genette's chart: extradiegetic-homodiegetic. This combination provides a very interesting relationship between the narrator and the hero, which Genette calls the autobiographical form. In this form, there are two pillars that serve as the main components of the narrative voice structure: the narrating I (erzählendes Ich) and the narrated I (erzähltes Ich) (Genette, 1980, p. 252). These are actants, people —in this case— that play an active role in the narrative, which, in this particular form, are separated by a certain amount of time. The simple example that has been referred to multiple times before works to explain this relationship as well. The old man retelling his memories constitutes a narrator in the first degree who tells his own story: extradiegetic-homodiegetic paradigm. The old man would be the narrating I, because he is the one who is telling the story, while the younger version of that same man would be the narrated I, since he is the protagonist of the story the old man is telling. The narrator and the hero are separated the same way: the former would be the old man, and the latter would be the younger version of the man. Now, the time that is separating the narrating I from the narrated I is, for example, 35 years. This means that the narrating I has knowledge, wisdom and experience for 35 more years than the narrated I, and he also knows of events that, for the young version of himself, have not happened yet. The consequence of this construction is that the voice of the old man, the narrator, has an authority that can be expressed in a condescending or judgemental tone regarding his own past actions, or in a sugar coating of what he now considers to have been mistakes in his younger years. It is important to clarify that when the form is referred to as autobiographical it does not mean that it has to be exclusively the narration of the author's life. This concept is used because it is a person telling a story that is theirs, that happened to them. The extradiegetic narrator does not need to be real to constitute an autobiographical form in the way Genette poses it. In Proust and in the example of the old man, the extradiegetic narrator is fictive, but it constitutes a Genettian autobiographical form.

The last set of concepts presented regarding *Narrative Discourse* are two functions of the narrator. Genette tries to equate the functions of language that Jakobson proposed in linguistics to the narrator. The communicative function is equated with both the phatic and the conative function that Jakobson described, which means it is the one that verifies the contact and accounts for the acting on the receiver. In narration, this translates into the function that concerns the contact, the dialogue, what the narrator wants or does not want to build with the narratee —the receiver, the

reader—. Genette summarises it in the orientation of the narrator toward the narratee (1980, p. 255). Implicit in this function is the question of who the narrator is telling the story to and all of the implications the answer has in the form of narrating. The second, the ideological function, is paralleled to the emotive function, and it is defined as "[…] the one accounting for the part the narrator as such takes in the story he tells, the relationship he maintains with it —an affective relationship, of course, but equally a moral or intellectual one." (Genette, 1980, p. 256). This function is also designated with the word orientation, but this time it refers to the orientation of the narrator toward themselves. It is labelled ideological function because Genette states that, in certain cases, authors will use their narrator to interject in the story in the form of authorised commentary or didactic advice, revealing the ideological points of view of said narrator.

Childhood

The next idea explored and defined to be able to understand the narrative voice and the novel is childhood. This concept has a had many definitions over the years, based on ideas from a handful of disciplines like philosophy, pedagogy, psychology, and psychoanalysis. For the purposes of the present study, the concept will be explored in four parts: first, using John Locke's concept of *tabula rasa*; second, considering Jean Jaques Rosseau's natural good; third, by Sigmund Freud's definition of the sexual child; and fourth, through Jean Piaget's developmental psychology. These four ideas are used to construct a working definition of "child".

John Locke first approached the idea of childhood and education in a set of letters he sent his cousin and her husband. Locke drew on his medical and philosophical knowledge to advise their family how he thought they should raise their children. He published a compilation of this correspondence in the 1963 book *Some Thoughts Concerning Education,* which became largely important for the subsequent debate about the nature of children. In his letters Locke elaborated some principles he had discussed a couple of years before regarding what was known at the time as the 'innate principles' of man. The belief was that all people are born with a set of ingrained ideas, core knowledge, that permits their inclusion in the social order. Locke thought that this principle had no basis, because if it were real, then these characteristics would be recognised by all mankind, so he came up with the opposite idea. He proposed that children come into the world as *tabula rasa*, or

blank slates, and developed into rational humans through the right guidance (Cleverly and Phillips, 1986, p. 16; Kehily, 2004, p. 5). Locke's idea brought with it many new questions regarding the nature of knowledge and where it came from. People involved in philosophy and education began to propose theories based on the acceptance of Locke's proposition, that the human mind was absolutely empty when it was first conscious. Locke himself answered the question of the origin of the mind's contents, pointing to experience as the source of all possible knowledge for humans. From what seems to be a simple statement, Locke constructed a whole philosophical system that would become the foundation of his widely known theories on politics and economics. His blank-slate idea was largely accepted, especially in pedagogical circles, and its predominance would influence the history of education from there on, and, in doing so, it would become central to the concept of childhood.

Even though Locke's idea attracted much attention, it was not unchallenged, and it shared the ideas of the XVII and XVIII centuries Puritan evangelists, who claimed something that opposed what Locke had proposed. The Puritans argued man carries original sin in his nature, and that any serious education plan or consideration about children had to admit this as a fact, and work around it (Cleverly and Phillips, 1986, p. 29). This meant that children were not as blank as Locke had proposed, but they carried a mark of ungodliness that had to be corrected by the good guidance of the church. Now, this point of view did not exactly challenge Locke's, because the latter did not have to do with morality, but with knowledge. Locke did not say that children were innately good or bad, but that they had no knowledge. However, having no knowledge translated to no sense of morality, because in Locke's view, children could not be able to tell whether they were right or wrong simply because they did not understand what right or wrong were. This became a contingent point of debate regarding education, because people started wondering what the best manner to deal with a kid was. This is where Jean Jaques Rosseau becomes very important.

Rosseau, the father of what is known in childhood studies in terms of Romantic discourse, worked on his definition of childhood and the nature of children in the mid-1800s when the Puritan ideas of original sin where very prevalent. At the time, the discussion had two sides: the fundamentalists and the reformists. The first group was in line with Puritan thought and advised parents not to be permissive with their children because that would prepare the ground for their innate evil to be fostered. They also built schools with this idea as a leit motif, developing pedagogical strategies to

correct the wrongs that they believed their students were born with. On the other hand of the debate, the reformists believed that this mark that Puritans placed on children was unfounded, defending the 'natural goodness' of children's hearts. Rosseau's postulates on the subject followed the second school of thought. In some of his writings he implied that children were born amoral and then developed ideas of good and evil —much like the process Locke described for the acquisition of knowledge— but more often, he wrote about the idea that children were originally righteous, not originally sinful (Kehily, 2004, p. 5). He defended that "the first impulses of nature are always right; there is no original sin in the human heart, the how and the why of the entrance of every vice can be traced." (Rosseau in Cleverly and Phillips, 1986, p. 34.

Rosseau's ideas outlived by far those of the Puritan fundamentalists, being as influential as Locke's propositions had been before. And, as referred to above, the Romantic discourse reinforced the *tabula rasa* idea, providing the concept of childhood with two of its most important features. Thus, after the eighteenth century, childhood was associated with a time of innocence, purity, and naivety. Whatever evil recognised in children was blamed on their environment, pointing to what had been instilled as the cause for their behaviour, and cleansing the child of any responsibility. Although some new ideas were proposed about childhood and children, Locke and Rosseau were at the core of all the studies on the topic for over a century. Together, their ideas lived unchallenged in the Western world, and were included in school curriculums, childcare manuals, and state law. Due to this incredible longevity and status, the psychoanalytical test that the concepts were put under at the dawn of the twentieth century seemed even more critical. Sigmund Freud entered the field of childhood studies and shook the pillars of its conception when he confronted the pure image of the child with the idea of sexuality.

Freud was met with controversy for many of his publications, but in no field was he more resisted than in the field of childhood studies. This was, in part, because of the dimensions of the ideas he challenged, but mostly, because he decided to study two entities that had never had scholar proximity in the past. Before Freud, the idea of sex was never remotely close to the idea of childhood. The debates around sexuality were in the realm of adulthood; pleasure, desire, procreation, all where such topics were reserved to the adults. Adults talked about them and adults were involved with them. Children had nothing to do with any of it. And to make matters even more complicated, since Locke and Rosseau, childhood was not only far from sexuality, but

conceived as incompatible with it, for it stood in the dimension of purity. So, when Freud —after publishing *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* in 1905 and formulating the Oedipus complex in 1910— concluded that children definitely had a sexual life, with a whole range of libidinous and perverted activities, he was met with rejection. Freud, however, defended his position with multiple publications, arguing that the innocence that had defined childhood for many years was nothing more than adult wishful thinking. He proposed that the systems of education and parenting had to be changed in the light of these new discoveries, because for many years parents, teachers, doctors and philosophers had built a perception of the nature of children that was deficient. Freud challenged the two ideas that were the ground on which the understanding of childhood stood. With his sexual child, he challenged both Locke and Rosseau by stating that children's minds where not a blank slate, nor a place of pure thoughts; the child's mind was "a storehouse of sexual knowledge in varying stages of completeness, which the child had put together as it (sic) strove to gain an intellectual grasp on its most urgent problems" (Cleverly and Phillips, 1986, p. 61).

The crisis that Freud ignited for the *tabula rasa* and the Romantic discourse was revolutionary. He proposed to completely change the imagery of children that had been built since Rosseau and the reformists won the debate back in the mid eighteenth century. However, Freud's ideas did not age well, and the two predominant discourses held the upper hand after the initial shock of the psychoanalyst's theories. The idea of children as perverted beings did not sit well in academic or common circles, and slowly the Freudian sexual childhood started to fade, giving way for a new corner of childhood studies to be explored. Developmental psychology was now in the limelight, reaching its first big theory in 1936 posed by Jean Piaget, who carried out the most extensive research on this topic, earning him recognition as one of the most important psychologists in the twentieth century. Piaget elaborated on his theory of cognitive development on the grounds of interviews he had with children of different ages. He then designed a set of stages based on what he observed during interviews. Each stage constituted a step in the development of children's cognitive ability, with certain types of thinking out of reach for children who had not gotten to that stage yet. The Swiss psychologist conceptualised that the process of development of children's minds worked towards finding balance. Their brains built a structure to carry out cognitive processes that allowed their interaction with the environment, and when it found an obstacle, it developed new structures to get to a new equilibrium. (Cleverly and Phillips, 1986, pp. 86, 87; Piaget, 1975, p. 17).

Piaget's theories had an important impact on modern schooling systems, as the idea of separating children in grades based on their ages came from the stages that the Swiss had designed. His conceptualisation of the development of knowledge in children's brains stated that they began with simple structures for simple knowledge and developed as obstacles were found in the way. This meant that the starting point of children's minds was the simplest structure. Even though Piaget expressed that he did not believe children were blank slates as Locke did, the imagery that had persisted for so long seemed to find comfort in the proposal that cognitive development offered. And, after the Freudian crisis challenged that long standing idea, Piaget became a figure to revitalise the Romantic and *tabula rasa* discourses. If children's minds build structures from simple to complex, then that meant that what Freud had proposed was not possible. Children either did not know anything or knew just a little, and what they did think about was pure and innocent. The cognitive development theory brought childhood back to innocence.

As shown, the concept of childhood has always been very complex, but the idea of innocence, purity, naivety, an almost holy goodness has been fundamental. Locke and Rosseau proposed two ideas that, together, have been unmovable, and that created an imagery of children that is still present to this day. Even Freud's revolutionary claim was not enough to change the perspective from which children and childhood are commonly approached. And with Piaget as a major influence since the mid twentieth century, the innocent and naïve image of childhood has only been getting stronger. This imagery is the one that has had the upper hand for centuries now and is going to be the way childhood is understood in the present study: children are beings who's understanding of the world is limited, both because of lack of experience and lack of mental tools, which means that their young minds are able to construct and comprehend only pure, innocent and naïve thoughts. This conceptualisation of the child is one of the two axes of the narrative voice structure in *TKaM*, and its understanding is imperative not only to approach the form, but also the content that the author creates, a concept that is defined in the following section.

Content

After Mikhail Bakhtin's death in 1975, several of his notes and essays were revised, compiled, and published in a number of different books, which mapped out a wide study of literature as an art

form, through the lens of a highly developed perspective that the Russian theorist had worked on for most of his life, and that would become influential in the field of literary and artistic theory in the years that followed. One of these publications was titled *Questions of Literature and Aesthetics*, and it included one of Bakhtin's most important essays, in which he established the basis for his approach to literary studies: "The problem with the content, the material, and the form". In this essay, Bakhtin dissects the reasons why he believes material aesthetics —a theoretical approach that focuses solely on the verbal material, leaving out of their field the author and the socio-historical context of the literary piece, close to most of the formalist work done in Russia at the time— is not a suitable perspective to study and understand literary works. After he deconstructs this method, he moves on to propose another way of thinking about literary works, which he builds around three axes as the title suggests: the content, the material, and the form.

The content is the one he focuses on with more detail, since it was the part of the work of art that he thought was pushed aside by the theorists who used the material aesthetics approach. The first thing that Bakhtin sets out to do to be able to define this concept is to underline the importance of the relationship between art, the world and life. In material aesthetics, the focus on the verbal material and the form took the forefront of literary studies, which meant that the relationship that a work of art could have with the world was very reduced. The author was undermined because it was considered irrelevant to the analysis, and by leaving this figure out of consideration, Bakhtin believes this approach truncated an incredibly important part of the work of art, namely, the link that it has with life and the world where it comes from. The consequence of this perspective being the starting point to understand a literary work is that the object of study is isolated, believed to be completed on its own with no need to consider anything outside of the object itself. This is Bakhtin's main grievance with material aesthetics, so he is quick to explain why burning the bridge between life and art is such a problem. For him, a novel or a poem cannot be considered art if they do not have an evaluative position. This evaluation, imperative for his aesthetic theory, is only possible if the work is considered along with the pre-existing reality, because this world is alive and has meaning, and when an artistic piece is created, it also has a significance that enters in a dialogue with said world —and its corresponding meanings (Bajtín, 1989, pp. 31, 32, 34, 35). Bakhtin is very clear: the work of art has political, economic, social, religious, and cognitive meanings that pose an evaluative position when confronted to their parallel meanings in the outside world, and a theory of art cannot intend to separate them, because when it does, it is disassembling

the evaluative position, and when there is no evaluative position, there is no art. He also remarks that this evaluation is what makes an aesthetic act so unique, what makes it different from knowledge or fact: it is in constant conversation with the world, it is receptive to the significance that the world has and how it relates to the one it builds within itself.

Bakhtin's apology of the necessary relationship between the world and the work of art does not mean that the reality of the author is simply transposed from one space to another. He is very clear when he proposes that a process must take place for a proper work of art to be created. This is where Bakhtin includes the form and highlights its importance to achieve a literary piece that can be considered artistic. The real world is living, and an author decides to place themselves in a position where they are proposing an evaluative point of view about this world. The way an author can create art through literature is by taking the ethical actions or cognitive instances of the existing world, and from their evaluative position, aesthetisizing them through the artistic form (1989, pp. 34, 35, 37). The artistic form is the way by which this known reality is reworked into another evaluative plane, unifying, individualising and completing it in this new dimension. Bakhtin never dismisses the importance of the artistic form, but he does point out that it cannot exist on its own, and it cannot be considered the only path to interpreting a literary work. The form is a system that provides structural and functional tools, and as such, it helps the creation of the aesthetic object, but it cannot erase the relationship this new object and evaluative position have with the pre-existing reality that already has an evaluation. The annulment of the pre-existing reality, its meaning and its evaluative positions is what Bakhtin believes to be so detrimental to the interpretation of literary works in the proposals of the formalists and the material aesthetics theorists.

Before referring to Bakhtin's definition and explanation of the concept of content, it is important to address a highly relevant notion that was referred to before and has not been explored in detail yet: the aesthetic object. This is one of the most important additions of the new approach that Bakhtin is building, as it is the new object of study in his theory, and it includes the three important concepts that the Russian theorist highlighted in the title of the essay that is being discussed here. This object is a carefully woven piece where the content, form and material are all in constant intersection and tension, which is why trying to separate them in the hopes of dissecting the object itself is unproductive (1989, p. 41). It is used instead of the expressions "literary work" or "literary

piece", setting a distance from other nomenclature, because this new concept implies that this object is the conclusion of an aesthetisation process, which in itself implies the importance of the pre-existing reality and the evaluative positions described before, codifying through one concept the carefully crafted pieces of Bakhtin's proposal. After setting these bases, the Russian theorist is able to introduce the new idea of concept, which he defines as the reality of a cognitive instance recognised in an existing reality, evaluated by the author, and moved to a different plane by the artistic form where it is unified and concluded, working as a part of the aesthetic object (1989, p. 37). So, the place where the content is originated is outside the artistic piece, because it is an instance that an author chooses to put through this aesthetisation process, which means that this choice is meaningful. This is why Bakhtin rescued the content and defended it with such rigor; his conception of art was being robbed of the origin of its idea, the seed of the creation process, which is, in all ways possible, tied to the aesthetic object.

In the interest of framing this new perspective of the content in an understandable manner, Bakhtin decides to use examples from two of the most recognised works in Russian literature: Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* and Tolstoi's *War and Peace*. He refers to literary investigators specifically, instructing them to be aware that when Ivan Karamazov is philosophically ruminating about non-acceptance or the meaning of children's suffering, he is not doing it in a purely cognitive manner, isolated by the limits of the literary form and just for the sake of his own mind. He is, by all means, in a dialogue with a cognitive instance or an ethical action which is real, present and completed in the world outside of the aesthetic object that Karamazov is a part of. His philosophical intuitions have characterization purposes because they constitute an element of Ivan's moral standpoint regarding life, as well as the types of relationships he holds with other characters, while being directed towards the instance that has been aesthetisized by means of the artistic form (1989, p. 44). At the same time, this meditation is serving a purpose in the aesthetic object and it is referring to the instances outside of it, because Karamazov is not only a character in a novel, he is a creation from an author that is surrounded by morality, ideas, people, systems; an author who is putting forward an evaluative perspective of his surroundings. This is also the way Andrei Bolkonski's sociological and historic soliloquys are explored. His thoughts about war, about individuals and about history are not just isolated bits of knowledge, they are pieces of the world that Tolstoi wanted to write about, aesthetisized and carefully placed in his artistic creation so that they function harmoniously in the system within it. They help build

Bolkonski's personality and his ethical perspective, as well as elements that surpass his personal life, such as his social and historical context, all of which have infinite ties with these cognitive instances in the pre-existing reality. The recognition of this reality that is outside, that exists before the artistic creation, that is processed aesthetically and unified by the form, is what Bakhtin labels content and what he asks literary investigators not to forget about.

A relevant note that Bakhtin includes in this essay about investigation in literature is that, even though the recognition of a pre-existing reality is imperative for the understanding of the aesthetic object, the analysis cannot become a study of this reality. Bakhtin believes that the research that focuses on these contextual elements has its perks, and that it is certainly an interesting perspective to study but argues that literary investigation cannot make anything else their object of study other that the aesthetic object itself. The work that focuses on all the other surrounding elements can be sociological, political or historical —depending on the perspective chosen— but it cannot be deemed literary. Bakhtin suggests that proper literary aesthetic analysis must understand the significance of the content in the system of the aesthetic object, which means in the way it is completed by the artistic form. He insists that the form and the content must be understood together, as content of the form and form of the content, as a whole system. However, this recognition cannot exceed the literary work, the aesthetic object, which means that the object itself limits the study. It is inside the frame of the literary work that any analysis must be made, resorting to the pre-existing reality exclusively to address the content in its whole significance, but not to look for meanings in an extra-literary space (1989, p. 46).

In this framework, three different theoretical journeys have been described in order to approach Harper Lee's novel, the object of study of this research. The first section highlighted several concepts from Gerard Genette's study of narrative formal structures in *Narrative Discourse*. These were the ideas of analepsis and anachrony in terms of narrative time, which define temporal relationships resulting from the narration of events that happened in the past, and first/second degree narrators —which can also be labelled extradiegetic and metadiegetic respectively—, homodiegetic narrators, metaleptical transgressions, and autobiographical form, which refer to the construction of the narrative person and the way it relates to the story. The second section described the concept of child in a historical exploration of proposals from John Locke, Jean Jacques

Rosseau, Sigmund Freud and Jean Piaget, which concluded with the realisation that the modern imagery of the notion is the consequence of a reversion to the purity, innocence and naivety that the first two theorists developed after the Freudian approach was widely rejected and Piaget's behavioural psychology widely accepted. The third and final section delved into Bakhtin's content, highlighting the importance he ascribes to the cognitive instance and the pre-existing reality that an author chooses, which then goes through a process of aesthetisation to be transformed into the content of the aesthetic object by way of the artistic form, reformulating the predominant formalist perspective that was predominant in his time and considering the aesthetic object from an integral perspective with a clear and detailed working structure.

Chapter I: Jean Louise and Scout

The narrator in *TKaM* has certain peculiarities that might be difficult to see at first. Even though most of the novel is narrated by Scout Finch, the seven-year-old protagonist is not the only voice that this construction uses. There is another voice in a different point in time that comes in and out of focus throughout the novel. This seemingly small detail has impactful consequences in the way the story is told, and they are achieved through the use of the Genettian formal tools that were explored in the Theoretical Framework.

The whole story is narrated from in an analeptical perspective regarding the narrator's present. This might be obvious for some, but for others it might be surprising, because, throughout the novel, it seems like the events are all presented in a fairly chronological manner, but most importantly, because the introduction of this narrative positioning is presented with such little emphasis, it can be easily forgotten. This is not to say it was a failure on the author's part, but just a decision that influences the reception and one that can lead to mistaken interpretations.

The novel opens as follows:

> When he was nearly thirteen, my brother Jem got his arm badly broken at the elbow. When it was healed, and Jem's fears of never being able to play football were assuaged, he was seldom self-conscious about his injury […] When enough years had gone by to enable us to look back on them, we sometimes discussed the events leading to his accident. I maintain that the Ewells started it all, but Jem, who was four years my senior, said it started long before that. (Lee, 2002, p. 3)

It is, very clearly, the recounting of a memory. The narrator is going to tell the story of her brother's injury. Truly, and structurally speaking, *TKaM* is the story of how Jem Finch broke his arm, with his sister acting as the narrator. And the author is very aware that this is the story she is telling, since the novel ends with Jem in bed after the accident that led to the injury where everything began; it is an absolutely circular narrative. However, this opening is easily forgotten since the novel is not *really* about Jem's accident. As the themes are brought up in the story, this initial idea of the reminiscence of an accident quickly fades, and it seems like the story did not start like this. Due to the way the author writes her passages, there is the feeling that the story is told by seven-year-old Jean Louise, when really it is a very different situation. That opening explicitly states the focus of the narration and it changes the dynamics of the characters and events from there on.

Because this is an analeptical form of story-telling, Genette argues that the two different times establish a relationship of anachrony characterised as follows: the narrator of the story is Jean Louise Finch, an adult, who is remembering events that took place when she was seven, and which culminated in an accident that left her brother with a weird looking arm. All the events she tells, recountings based on her memory of the situations, are passages of her memory, like pictures of what happened in her childhood. The present of the narration is not Maycomb County in the 1930s but wherever Jean Louise was and in whatever year she decided to set her memories as an aesthetic object.

Genette holds that the analysis of a narrative voice requires a separation to take place first, between the narrative instance and the story. These two phenomena are in a temporal relationship that needs to be addressed before moving forward in the exploration of the voice. The narrator-story relationship in *TKaM* falls into the category Genette called subsequent narration. This type of relationship defines the perspective in two ways: first, it means that the story is positioned behind the event of the narration; and second, it means that the relationship disregards the duration of the story in the narration, meaning that it does not take into account the interval of time it took for the story to take place. Thus, the novel is in an analeptical construction. What was labelled as the present of the narrator —old Jean Louise's time, when and where she is recalling her young years— is in the narration instance, while the memory of the past —what was concluded to be the whole novel in analeptical position, in a temporal point before older Jean Louise's time— is the story. What is told is the story; from where and when is told, the event of the telling of the story, is the narration instance. The perspective is then constructed as follows. First, the narration instance is somewhere and sometime after the accident that resulted in Jem's odd arm, which would be Jean Louise's present. This, thought of as a point in a timeline, is positioned ahead of the point of the story. The story would constitute everything that is narrated throughout the novel, a little over a year of Jean Louise's life when she was a child. Second, it is not important to consider the time that the story takes up in the narration instance. This means that the time that it took older Jean Louise to tell the story of how Jem broke his arm is irrelevant because the story and the narration instance never overlap in the timeline. The two points are separated and never intersect materially —they intersect in the narrator's mind, but not in physical time. The story ends before the narration instance begins.

According to Genette, because the narration instance and the story never meet, this first one ends up having no need for progressive movement. Because the story never really needs to be in the temporal point of the narration instance, this second point becomes atemporal. Genette concludes, then, that this type of relationship —subsequent narration— exists in a paradox where the story has a specific temporal situation, but the narration instance has an atemporal essence (1980, p. 233). This idea of a paradoxical construction adds to the fast-paced introduction of the analeptical relationship referred to above. While reading, it seems like *TKaM* is a novel about a seven-year-old girl telling the reader about her life, her family, and her experiences. This is true, but only in part, because the older Jean Louise that is in the temporal point of the narration instance influences the narration at all times. Because the reader never goes back to her present —older Jean Louise's— it feels like she is not there. However, not considering her part in the narrative voice is a mistake that leads to believe that the narrator is much simpler that than the actual perspective displayed in the novel. At the same time, the fact that the narration instance is atemporal makes for a fluidity in older Jean Louise that lets her hover over her memories with freedom, without the reader noticing that it is her who they are reading. Also, the freedom that older Jean Louise has because of the atemporality of her position, provides her with the possibility of establishing anachronical relationships between her own time and the time of the story she is narrating. So, this characteristic of subsequent narration influences *TKaM* in three ways: first, it makes the voice in the narrative instance, older Jean Louise's, veiled, like she is not really there; second, it gives that older voice a freedom to move around her memories without being attached temporally to a specific instance; third, due to this freedom, the voice in the narrative instance establishes an anachronical relationship with the voice in the story, as well as in the events that take place in that temporal position.

This concept of subsequent narration, specifically the paradoxical existence of the two temporal points, is expressed in the following excerpt early on in the novel, when Scout goes to her first day of school:

> Impatience crept into Miss Caroline's voice: "Here Walter, come get it."
>
> Walter shook his head again.
>
> When Walter shook his head a third time someone whispered. "Go on and tell her Scout."

> I turned around and saw most of the town people and the entire bus delegation looking at me. Miss Caroline and I had conferred twice already, and they were looking at me in the innocent assurance that familiarity breeds understanding.
>
> I rose graciously on Walter's behalf: "Ah — Miss Caroline?"
>
> "What is it, Jean Louise?"
>
> "Miss Caroline, he's a Cunningham." (Lee, 2002, p. 22)

For the sake of clarity, from now on the narrator placed in the narration instance —older Jean Louise who is remembering her story— is referred to as Jean Louise, while the narrator placed in the story —child Scout who is living these experiences— is referred to as Scout. There is a strange tonal shift in that piece of the novel alone. In the first part, Scout is describing what is happening between her teacher and one of her classmates, Walter. The way it is written seems like how a seven-year-old would describe the situation, with short sentences and concise exposition. However, the three lines in the middle that begin with "I turned around…" have a very different language, with longer constructions and low-frequency words and expressions, which seem odd for a young child to be using —the likes of 'conferred', 'innocent assurance' or 'breeds understanding'. Also, the idea that "familiarity breeds understanding", which is already a sophisticated way to put it, is preceded by the modifier "innocent". It seems unlikely that a child would perceive something as innocent, as they have not had enough experiences to use that expression truthfully, nor would they think of such a situation in those specific terms. What would make sense, however, is that Jean Louise was the voice who expressed that idea instead of Scout. The last part of the excerpt goes back to the short, simple constructions that would denote that Scout has taken back the reins of the narration. This is a very clear example of how the two characters who fulfill the place of the narrator exist in different moments but can seem to be interacting due to the flexibility that the paradoxical nature of the subsequent type of narration provides. As stated above, this choice in narration type is characterised three-fold. Jean Louise is in the background, in a way, hidden from recognition for the reader who is focused on Scout's story. Jean Louise is also leaving her place in the narration instance for a moment to come to the space and time of the story and comment on the situation her seven-year-old self is living. The anachronism is evident, as this interjection from Jean Louise into Scout's place creates a feeling of strangeness that indicates a relationship between voice and time

that is not right, an adult woman speaking in the place of a child. This kind of interjection is common in the novel and it appears several times.

Moving forward with Genette's concepts, he makes sure to organise the narrative points in degrees, for the readers to be able to understand which temporal instance is which. As referred to, these degrees can be infinite, as long as the author adds temporal points. In *TKaM*, the author builds her novel on two degrees only. The narration instance —where Jean Louise is — is the first degree, while the story —Scout's present— is the second one. As their names suggest, the hierarchy goes from the highest rated degree to the lowest; the main narrative event is Scout's present, because the whole novel is focused on it, while Jean Louise's time is there in abstract and the reader never lives in it. Genette labels these degrees, and from this point on, his concepts are the ones that are used in the present study. The first degree is the extradiegetic narration, and the second degree is the metadiegetic narration. The opening that was quoted above starts in the extradiegetic space and it moves quite rapidly onto the metadiegetic one, swiftly going from the present to the past in the form of a memory.

Now, Genette conceptualises two notions that deal with the kind of relationships that can occur between the narrative degrees, proposing that these are dynamic and that they can be focalised in different manners throughout a novel, changing the reader's perspective. The first one is the pseudo-diegetic narrative, in which the second degree narration takes over the first degree narration, replacing the focus and veiling the first level as much as possible. The second is the metalepses, which Genette includes to differentiate the deliberate change of focus of the pseudo-diegetic, to the seemingly unprecedented and transgressive situation in which a first degree narrator interrupts the second degree one, or vice versa. These two situations can coexist in the same novel, as well as the situation described before, of a much simpler extradiegetic narrator and a metadiegetic one which never meet or interact. *TKaM* uses two of these three dynamics: the extradiegetic/metadiegetic relationship with no interaction, and the metalepses. This first one was already labelled and recognised with the first quote referred to. The opening of the novel suggests a clear and strict separation of the degrees which, albeit swift and quick. The fact that the separation occurs so fast and with no focus on it, or that it is easily missed, does not mean that it constitutes a pseudo-diegetic narration. The pseudo-diegetic dynamics presents itself when a second degree narrator is so strong that it completely takes over the first degree one and moves it away from the

hierarchal structure. The second degree takes up most of the space of *TKaM*, but it is not as strong as to outshine the first degree narrator. Even though the first degree narrator, Jean Louise, is veiled throughout most of the story, she is definitely present and is never shoved aside by Scout. The metalepses was already partially dealt with when the subsequent narrative paradox was being explained with the example of Scout in school: the tonal and formal shift in the middle of the excerpt seemed intrusive, which is exactly the kind of feeling elicited when there is a metalepses happening between the levels. When Jean Louise, whose narration belongs on a different degree, enters the space and time of Scout's narration it is strange and feels off, just like Genette described the metalepses to be. These transgressions of degrees, or narrator's intrusions, happen often in the novel and attest Jean Louise's importance and the point in time she is at. There is a constant relationship referring back and forth from Scout, the child narrator, to Jean Louise, the adult narrator, and it shows in the way certain moments are portrayed in the novel, moments such as the one quoted above.

In terms of Genettian narrative time, then, *TKaM* is defined in the following manner: first, the opening introduces the reader to an analeptical structure of the novel, in which Jean Louise is reminiscing a period in her childhood, on the events that led her brother to break his arm and leaving him with a distorted body shape. This means that the whole story is presented in the past tense, an adult's childhood memory. Second, this novel is built upon the subsequent narration described by Genette, which means that there is a separation between the story and the narrative instance; the former is Scout's present, her childhood in the 1930's, while the latter is Jean Louise's time as an adult remembering the events that led to her brother's accident. Third, the subsequent narration time structure includes a paradox in which Jean Louise's present does not need to move forward because the story is not happening there, meaning that it becomes an instance set in time, but atemporal in function. This provides that second point in a time —and, consequently, the narrator at that point— of freedom to move around the story where Scout is the protagonist. Fourth, the are two degrees in *TKaM* as Genette saw them. The first degree is Jean Louise's present, or the narration instance, and the second is Scout's present, or the story. These are the extradiegetic narration and the metadiegetic narration respectively. And fifth, these narrative degrees interact in two ways inside the novel: the first, when the extradiegetic and the metadiegetic are separated and do not interact, and the second, the metalepses, when the extradiegetic narrator transgresses her point in time and pushes herself into the metadiegetic level.

The definition of the narrative time structure only makes up part of the elements considered relevant to describe the author's work from the perspective of *Narrative Discourse*. The other part comes in the form of an analysis of the narrative person. The narrator of *TKaM* is considered a Genettian autobiographical form. The first step is the recognition of the homodiegetic first person. As aforementioned, Genette divides the first person perspective into two categories which are very strictly separated; one is a type of first person in which the narrator tells stories that they are not part of, and the other is a type of perspective where the narrator tells their own story. It has been established that the narrator of *TKaM* is Jean Louise Finch, and that she is telling the story of how her brother Jem broke his arm, which comprises about a year of her childhood when she was seven years old. There is no doubt that this narrator is the homodiegetic type, present in her own story. As opposed to the narrative time, in which it was discussed that the strategies used veiled one of the narrators and that the different points in time bred confusion, the narrative person is very straight forward.

Combining the narrative levels labelled above and the narrative person, Genette builds a guide that comprises various types of narrative constructions, ones which are frequently used in literary narration. *TKaM* is constructed under the paradigm of extradiegetic-homodiegetic, meaning that it has a narrator on a separate point in time telling their own story in the past tense. Jean Louise, the narrator in the narrative instance point as an adult, is telling the reader the story of herself at seven, Scout, who lives in Alabama in the 1930s. As this paradigm implies narrator who is also the hero in the story, Genette delves into the dynamics that arise from having those two actants as the very pillars of the narrative structure. The division that was made before between the narration instance and the story, and each of the narrators that occupy these spaces and time periods, works for these concepts as well. Jean Louise is the extradiegetic narrator and Scout, the metadiegetic narrator. Transferred to the extradiegetic-homodiegetic paradigm, these two are the narrator and the hero, or, borrowing from German narratology, the 'narrating I' and the 'narrated I'. The dynamics that Genette explores has to do with the way the former approaches the experiences of the latter. Viewed in a timeline, the narrating I exists at a point in time after the narrated I, Jean Louise exists after Scout. This means that every experience she is telling us comes from the lens of somebody who already lived these events and knows their consequences, which influences the way she is telling what happened; it denotes that everything that is read in this novel is veiled by the filter of a memory, and by the filter of a narrator that was once a hero in her own story. This is her own story

written from her own perspective. Then, her interjections —like the one that was examined in depth above— are not only very present, but obvious, since she has to comment on her past from the knowledge at the point of her remembrance. The way Jean Louise looks at —and writes about— Scout is in fond nostalgia, but also in judgement, authority and condescendence, since she has much more wisdom learned throughout the years that Scout has not yet lived. Genette labelled this type of narrative person construction, for obvious reasons, the autobiographical form: an extradiegetic narrator telling the story of their own life.

This sort of commentary comes in different degrees of directness. In some passages of the novel the interjection is subtle, and it is only noticeable when observed in great detail. Scout's second quote in school that has been referred to several times is already an example of this opaque transgression, only noted through changes in tone and verbal material, but not in an overtly explicit manner. In other cases, Jean Louise's interruption is much more transparent, like in chapter 11:

> In later years, I sometimes wondered exactly what made Jem do it, what made him break the bonds of "You must be a gentleman, son," and the phase of self-conscious rectitude he has recently entered. Jem had probably stood as much guff about Atticus lawing for niggers as had I, and I took it for granted that he kept his temper —he had a naturally tranquil disposition and a slow fuse. At the time, however, I thought the only explanation for what he did was that for a few minutes he simply went mad. (Lee, 2002, p. 118)

This passage comes at a time in the story when Atticus has already been appointed as defendant for Tom Robinson's case. In Maycomb, people around Scout were already being foul towards the lawyer and his work, gossiping about how despicable defending a black man was. Scout had already gotten in trouble for catching fights in the hopes of defending her father's name, but Jem tried to behave as an adult and be a better person. However, in this instance, the calm Jem went to Mrs. Dubose's garden and chopped off all the camelia flowers that had sprouted in her bushes due to the rage that she incited by insulting Atticus for his work. The way the excerpt is introduced clearly signals the Jean Louise's voice, opening with a time modifier that reminds the reader that she is telling this story. She, however, does not stop there, but continues pondering, in her adult voice, the event that is going to be described, and highlighting the strangeness of them due to Jem's calm way of handling all the judgement their father was enduring up to that point. As in the previous quote, she used expressions such as "self-conscious rectitude" and "tranquil disposition" which

indicate a sophisticated expression, and where such terms are codes of adult language. The last sentence settles this condescending tone of reminiscence, because Jean Louise spent several lines of writing on analysing how different her younger self was from her brother, how surprising his reaction was and how he disobeyed their father's advice. She took into account all of those details to try to clear up the oddness of Jem's actions. But, as Scout, as the kid, there was no explanation for what he did. The answer needed not to be pondered, it was simple: her brother had lost his mind for a couple of minutes. This striking contrast between the adult and the kid's processes of understanding portray very clearly the dynamics Genette referred to. In this passage the distance between the narrating I and the narrated I is palpable, and the reader is presented with an adult woman who is not only aimlessly remembering, but actively challenging her past behaviours and thoughts with the new-found knowledge she had acquired since these events happened.

The relationship that the narrator has with the story they are telling is the subject of one last group of concepts that Genette focused on and that are applicable in *TKaM*. Genette's starting point is Roman Jakobson's functions of language, which he published in his essays on poetics and linguistics, classifying and labelling the different elements of language, and how these show themselves in a speech act. Genette reformulates Jakobson's functions to be applied to the narrative voice in literary texts. The first one is labelled communicative function and it comes about in *Narrative Discourse* by combining the phatic and conative Jakobsian functions, which stand for the verification of the contact between the message and the addressee, and for the reaction of said receiver to the message, respectively. Referred to narration, it is the dialogue the narrator wants to and seeks to have with the narratee, or the receiver —or the lack of contact, if the case is such. One of the important questions that this function is concerned with is the query of who is the narrator talking to or addressing their story to, who is this novel for? The second function is the ideological function, which comes from the Jakobsian emotive function. This function is concerned with the kind of relationship the narrator keeps with the story they are telling, which for Genette is multifaceted, as it is at the same time an emotional, moral, and intellectual relationship. So, if the communicative function addressed the bond built between a narrator and the reader, the ideological function addresses the link between the narrator and the story they are telling. Both these narrative functions Genette describes are useful tools to understand the construction of a narrative voice and to prompt an analysis of how the voice affects the reader and the story.

The previously analysed excerpt, where Jean Louise reflects on Jem's actions, can be looked at through the lens of the Genettian narrative functions. On one hand, in terms of the ideological function: it is very clear that Jean Louise is reminiscing with nostalgia, but also with a touch of judgement. The comparison in her process of thought as a child and as an adult conveys that feeling that Jean Louise is picking out her reactions to events from her past, finding the signs of her growth in her memories, while recognising her childish concerns and thoughts. On the other hand, in terms of the communicative function, the temporal modifier that Jean Louise includes at the beginning of the passage indicates that she wanted this specific event to be recognised by the reader as a memory, something that does not happen often in her narration. Even though the whole novel is written in a past tense, which signals the presence of the narrator in the present and the story in the past, there are a few instances where the narrator overtly interrupts the flow of the past events to intervene with a comment from her present self. When this happens, it is a way by which the narrator is attracting the reader's attention towards the event, to highlight a situation of injustice, misunderstanding, or discrepancy between Jean Louise and Scout's opinion, which is impactful enough to note. In this case, it is to bring to the forefront the way her child self thought about Jem's abrupt actions, how she got to her conclusions, and what her adult self thinks about the situation years after. These three instances might look very superficial and irrelevant, but when the more complex situations are presented —passages like the trial, the Finch's visit to Calpurnia's church, or Tom Robinson's death— these aspects that the narrator is emphasising become fundamental to the understanding of the narrative voice, and consequently, of great part of the novel.

A journey through *Narrative Discourse* used in *TKaM* has left a couple of important conclusions. The analyses of the narrative time and narrative voice created for the novel show that the narrator is a very complex kind of story teller, and that a distracted reading might not convey just how intricate this person is: one narrator in the present and one in the past, one in the first degree and one in the second, Jean Louise and Scout. Nonetheless, the case for this narrative voice is, technically speaking, not that of two narrators. This type of expression has been used for the sake of clarity, but the reality is that the narrator is one, temporally separated into two characters. One narrator, two different characters. It may be said that this definition is backwards, and instead, there are two narrators in one character. However, the temporal distance between Scout and Jean Louise is enough to believe that they are different characters, since their perspective of the events of childhood they are narrating has changed based on the experience that one has already had and the

other has not gone through. Also, the narrator never really splits completely because the first degree person, Jean Louise, is always present in her reminiscence, even if she is somewhat hidden —the subsequent narration paradox explains why she is so free to roam around within Scout's story. So, there is one narrator that is divided into two characters: the one in the present is an adult, Jean Louise, while the one in the past is a child, Scout. The older one is telling stories that live in her memory, events that she experienced herself when she was younger. Now, this intricate narrative voice that the author constructs is placed at a specific time and place, Alabama in the 1930s. Maycomb, even though it is a fictional town, is inspired by a real historical, social, and cultural context that the author chose and that is very influential for the perspective that the narrative voice proposes. The following chapter focuses on the conditions that inspired the setting of *TKaM*.

Chapter II: What a Wonderful World

The historical contexts that the author isolates, which are going to be aestheticised in the content and articulated into the architectonic form of the aesthetic object, are the Great Depression and the early Civil Rights Movement. The novel takes place in the early 1930s, when the consequences of Black Tuesday —the stock market crash of October 29th, 1929— were very palpable and set the stage for a decade of economic devastation for the United States. Even though President Herbert Hoover, who was appointed shortly before the crash, tried to address the various financial problems of the nation through relief programs, reforms in congress and new legislation, the Depression persisted and worsened deeply (Remini, 2008, p. 223). The economic data for his term (1929 - 1933) are truly alarming: around 50,504 banks closed from 1930 to the beginning of 1933 and almost fourteen million people were out of jobs; by the end of 1933 the income of the majority of United States citizens had been halved, more than a million home evictions had taken place due to impossibility to meet mortgage payments, and about 86,000 businesses had failed to succeed (Remini, 2008, pp. 220, 223). These conditions are the backdrop of Scout's story, where there was little to no chance of economic success, especially in rural areas and small towns that where far from the more active metropolitan areas. The Finches live in Maycomb, a very small town in Alabama, and the memories of Jean Louise picture what everyday life was like in this broken USA. Even though Atticus has one of the most prominent jobs in the town, even having a seat in the Alabama state legislature, he does not earn much and when Scout asks if they are poor, he simply answers affirmatively: "We are indeed" (Lee, 2002, p. 23). This sets the bar for everybody else in the town; if the most prominent lawyer was poor, the rest of them could not have been anything far off from that description, and they do not seem to be any better off than what the narrator is telling the audience.

Even though *TKaM* is set in the 1930s and the stories that Jean Louise is telling happen during the first years of that decade, the references to this period are laid very thinly and direct references to the issues of the time are infrequent. The economic collapse and its consequences are only shown tangentially through what was stated above, and if it were not for comments about other events like Hitler and the Third Reich, it would be difficult to place the novel where it is supposed to be set. The main conflict, Tom Robinson's trial and racial injustice, are also oddly placed in a time where racial issues where not in the forefront and were definitely not considered urgent for the general

public. This poses a problem to the Bakhtinian approach because if the cognitive instance was not entirely in the 1930s Deep South, then where is it? If the cognitive instance cannot be placed, then the content cannot be understood because the link with life that Bakhtin insisted on is not stable anymore. So, this problem must be solved and the first step to do so is to modify the query slightly, because the question is not the *where* but rather *when*. There is a different time from the one chosen for the setting of the novel that can be considered as influential for the composition of the aesthetic object: the time of creation. Harper Lee wrote and published her work between 1955 and 1960, when the historical conditions of the United States, especially the Deep South, were very different and had specific complications that are much more clearly woven in *TKaM*. Seen from this point in time, the main conflict makes much more sense, since these five years are known as the early Civil Rights Movement.

There are two important events that in that interval of time seem to be the cognitive instances the author decided to aesthetisize: the *Brown* court ruling and the Emmett Till case. The first one is considered the landmark decision that truly started legislative reform that launched the cause of civil rights in the US, since it was the case that initiated desegregation nationwide. Before its ruling on May 17th, 1954, the discourse around civil rights was much less confident because the laws that supported its claims were few and not really enforced by State or federal authorities. Even the president, Harry Truman (1945-1953) did not have enough support or influence to remove the Jim Crow Laws through Congress, which forced him to use executive powers to desegregate the military forces in 1948. However, all these troubled attempts at a new era of equality were justified when the Supreme Court, under Chief of Justice Earl Warren, reversed *Plessy v. Ferguson*, a ruling from 1896 which had allowed segregation in schools through their "separate but equal" claim. In the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* this separation in public schools was deemed unconstitutional because it violated the guarantee of equal rights to all citizens that the Fourteenth Amendment declared to protect. After the ruling, all federal district courts required local authorities to move rapidly towards the desegregation of all public schools in the country (Remini, 2008, p. 261). The support of the Supreme Court not only forced local and national authorities to see through the ruling with actions, but also inspired many black citizens to believe that change was real and was coming, and that the systems of the nation were going to help them in their pursuit of justice. A year after the *Brown* ruling, the Montgomery bus boycott was organised, and became the first of

many ways in which African American collectives began protesting for their rights to be respected and guaranteed by the law. The Civil Rights Movement had officially started.

However, it was not as smooth sailing as some would have wanted, mostly because in both the low and high houses of Parliament there was a very stark Southern opposition which was determined to obstruct these new laws as much as possible. It was not enough that newly elected president Dwight Eisenhower pushed for efficiency in the legislative enactment of civil right reform or that indignation from the constituents was growing with each bill that got jettisoned; the infighting in the Senate and the House of Representatives halted the progress that begun with the court ruling for three more years. It was not until 1957 that the first effective bill was introduced in Congress and provided the first Civil Rights Act, which included a series of measures aimed mainly at holding those who prevented black citizens from voting accountable in local court and, in doing so, increasing the number of said voters. Nonetheless, the bill was too weak to make these measures stick, and the Southern states were still too opposed to put the new laws in practice, which meant that the goals that the legislation set out to enforce were not met (Remini, 2008, p. 262). Still, the Civil Rights Act of 1957 was the first steppingstone for a movement that would arise more tension in the coming years, with protests, demonstrations, violence and chaos, mostly concentrated in the South, where both white citizens and authorities where reticent to the new order that placed black people at the same level as whites in the eyes of the law. It would take another seven years for all the efforts to come to fruition with a new Civil Rights Act in 1964 that was much more organic, which set out to correct the failures of the first bills and include measures that would actually get enforced nation-wide.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the pinnacle of the movement that started —at least in the wide public conversation— with the *Brown* case. The decision of the Supreme Court was what started getting citizens to wonder why it was so difficult being black in the USA and why it should be difficult in the first place. The landmark case was important because, not only did it start reform, but it sparked awareness that the conditions in which African Americans were living, as well as the way they were treated when they tried to protest for their basic rights, was nothing short of deplorable. The great nation of freedom was coming up short and the people started to wake up to that reality, which translated into more public support and pressure for the Congress to live up to the ideals that they were supposed to uphold (Remini, 2008, p. 270). The Deep South, which

includes the states of Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina and Alabama, was especially relevant in this movement, because it was, at the same time, a region which held some of the most impactful peaceful protests and demonstrations, and which saw some of the worst and most violent retaliation. Alabama was the site of the bus boycott in 1955 and the burning of the freedom riders' bus —which were sent to desegregate southern states— at the hands of the KKK in 1961, demonstrating how divided and tense the opinions of the public were (Remini, 2008, pp. 261, 267). Harper Lee was from Monroeville, a small town in Alabama, and between 1955 and 1960 she was going back and forth from the South to New York City, which makes it very probable for her to be aware of the issues that were troubling her home state. She was also knowledgeable in law, having studied it in college, and was the daughter of Amasa Coleman Lee, an Alabama lawyer who served in the state legislature from 1926 to 1938, making her suitable to understand the importance of the *Brown* ruling and the effects it was having in the judicial and legislative systems of the Deep South. These details of the author's life are brought up to be able to place her in the context that is being explored so that the connection between her and the events is clear enough so that it is recognisable how she isolated these real-life instances to craft her novel.

The other event that was mentioned and that the author, due to her closeness to law that was described above, probably was mindful of was the Emmett Till case. In September 1955, Roy Bryant and John William Milam, two white men, were tried in a Mississippi court for the murder of a 14-year-old black boy, Emmett Till. The murder was a retaliation for an alleged flirtatious advance from Till on Carolyn Bryant, Roy's wife. A couple of days after the alleged suggestive encounter with the woman, Bryant and Milam abducted Till from his uncle's house, beat him unconscious and drove him near the Tallahatchie River where they shot him. His body was found three days later with bruises all over and with such trauma that his face was unrecognisable. Bryant and Milam were acquitted by an all-white, all-male jury who only deliberated 67 minutes on the verdict (Chura, 2000, p. 4). The evidence shown in the case was very clear: Bryant and Milam where guilty of a homicide that was obviously racially motivated, but the courts showed a fundamental flaw in a system that they deemed fair when a jury let them go free just because the word of two white men was worth more than the lifeless body of a black boy. After the *Brown* ruling, this case caused indignation and made the front pages of newspapers in every state, becoming one of the most publicised trials in the century. With the newly raised awareness that was brewing and the overall climate that was building up regarding racial injustice, the acquittal of

these two men in the conditions of the case was not going to be looked over, and Emmett Till became a cause for civil rights organisations nationwide. His brutal homicide and the unfair trial that followed became a second spark that pushed forward the most notorious protests, demonstrations and speeches in the Civil Rights era. Just four months after Till's murder, the Montgomery bus boycott was taking place.

The Till case is important for the conception of *TKaM* not only because it was a catalyst for the movement that the novel draws so much from —the tension from the context is palpable in Harper Lee's work— but also because the details of the whole situation seem to have really inspired the creation of various characters and the main conflict of the plot. Patrick Chura, in his article "Prolepsis and Anachronism: Emmett Till and the Historicity of *To Kill a Mockingbird*" (2000), traces down the parallelisms that the author portrays in her work with the Till Case. The first one is the event itself: a black man, the part of Tom Robinson/Emmett Till, victim of racial injustice by the hands of white men, Bob Ewell and the jury/ Bryant, Milam and the jury, due to an allegedly "inappropriate" encounter with a white woman. The conditions are different, of course, because the trial for Bryant and Milam was a homicide that they were accused of, while the trial in *TKaM* had Tom Robinson accused of rape. However, the resemblances are still very poignant because the author is writing about this young man who was wrongfully convicted and later murdered, an innocent black man with a terrible fate due to racially motivated revenge, at a time when the Till case was still fresh in the general public's memory. The acquittal of Bryant and Milam also evokes *TKaM*, for the jury who deliberated on Tom Robinson's future was also all-white and all-male, and they got to a consensus where the black man was the one who got the worst part of the deal even if the proof and testimonies pointed at a different result. The judicial system that was operating in the author's mid-1950s context and the one that operates in Judge Taylor's court is always benefitting the white man, regardless of the fact whether he stands on the side of the defendant or the prosecutor. There are other details that Chura points out, like Tom Robinson's physical disability and the stuttering that Till suffered (p. 6); the role that the prosecutor Attorney Gerald Chatham played in the Till case and his resemblance to Atticus (p. 8) or the socio-economic status of the Ewells with that of Bryant and Milam (pp. 10, 11). These are all interesting points on their own, but they are not really relevant to the purpose of this chapter which is understanding how these events make up the content of the aesthetic object that is being studied. There is, however, one more point that Chura makes in his article that is crucial to the case that the author created in

TKaM, which is the reaction of the Southern states to the *Brown* ruling and how desegregation affected their view as black individuals. The ruling, which was meant for the desegregation of public schools, revealed a fear from white people in the South that, after 1955, was more real than ever. Now that their spaces were no longer separated, the possibility of interracial sex, was now a reality which challenged the idea of purity that characterised white supremacy. The idea that white women could now be sexually involved with black men instilled a new age where mixing was not only possible, but abided by law, which a lot of people were not ready to accept. The raging denial of this new reality resurrected with vigour a concept of southern nineteenth century imagery known as the black rapist, a dangerous and perverted black man who would lure innocent white women to pursue his desire (Chura, 2000, pp. 3, 4). This character that came back during the early Civil Rights era was the justification that Bryant and Milam used for their actions, and the main argument from the prosecutor in Tom Robinson's case. The idea that a white woman had to be protected by all means necessary from black men because all of them were a threat to her safety, her purity and her virginity, worked like a charm for the people who wanted to use violence to retaliate for the progress that these black communities were fighting for and that were, at long last, being recognised by the authority systems of the United States.

Though the purpose of Chura's article differs from the ones for this paper, he admits the importance of the Till case and the surrounding context to the creation of *TKaM* through his analysis. He writes:

> It was in this atmosphere of provocative racial tension and salient race-sex anxiety concurrent with frequent trips in the mid 1950s between New York and her home in Monroeville, Alabama that Harper Lee worked at the manuscript that was to become *To Kill a Mockingbird*. The conflict over the *Brown* decision, the nearby Emmett Till case, the racist literature distributed by the Citizens Councils, the first black bus boycott and the beginning of the civil rights movement in Montgomery in 1956 were conspicuous features of a state near fixation by national and regional media on Southern racial issues. The result is a novel that seems unquestionably to have passed through the transforming alembic of such powerful ideology. (2000, p. 15)

Harper Lee was living through all this unrest, she understood the court decisions and the trial acquittals, and she chose these conditions to put them through a process to craft her aesthetic object. The content that Bakhtin refers to is not just a transposition of the events she was seeing in her world into a novel, it is not an exercise of accounting the facts, of writing a chronicle. To be able

to make these cognitive instances the heart of a work of art, she had to assume an ethical evaluative perspective and have confront it with the evaluative stands that these real events, real people and real issues already had, and craft them into her aesthetic object. She does this in two distinct manners. First, she uses cross-historical references to be able to criticise her present in a time that seemed far away, amalgamating the 1930s with the 1950s to build the setting for her story. From the 1930s she keeps the ambiance of the town, the conditions of the people living in it, the struggle of a nation that was in devastating economical conditions. The everyday life that Scout shows the reader a reminder of that time of crisis, with her home and school situations depicting the experience of a child in those times. From the 1950s she takes the tension and the transformative movement that was happening right in front of her, and she builds a case that has devastating resemblances to her present to be able to comment on it. As Chura says, the novel that results from this process is absolutely intertwined with the times of its creation, with the polarising, scary and violent nature of the confrontations that were taking place; with the confusing and enraging consequences of the trials in which the word of a white man was against the word of a black man; with an unsettling reality where racial prejudice has fatal consequences. Second, she places a point of view for the readers to see all of the story through, someone who is telling this event from her unique perspective. This allows her to make comments about the times she chose to focus on, about the events she created, about the people who were involved in those events, directing the readers towards what Scout is seeing, thinking, learning and reflecting about. This choice is what reveals the most about her ethically evaluative perspective because the narrator has an outlook that criticises how the systems are working —not only the law, but also the school and the gender roles of her time. She crafts a picture with resources from both periods of time, places her characters and her conflicts, and then she builds a lens through which the readers can see this picture. With these two primary decisions she is putting the cognitive instances described through a process of aesthetisation, with the evaluative stands in constant dialogue, transforming what were historical situations the aesthetic content that Bakhtin identifies.

Chapter III: The Eye of the Beholder

Two conceptual axes have been established in the previous chapters to be able to understand the crafting of *TKaM*: the Genettian theory aided a deconstruction of the compositional form and the Bakhtinian theory tackled the context and its transformation into content. Now, the final aesthetic object is a result of the harmonic consolidation of these two. In the pevious section, two ways in which the author achieves her aesthetisation process were recognised: her work in creating the setting with two different time periods and her construction of a point of view that has a distinct ethically evaluative stand. Both of these processes are analysed alongside the narrative tools that were described in the first chapter regarding the construction of the narrative time and voice, in the hopes of making their connection clear.

As aforementioned, the construction of the setting with characteristics of two different decades is an artistic decision that enables the author to make comments from a fictional past about her real present. However, the merging of these different periods cannot be done without a formal tool that can transform them to coexist in a novel that is meant to be read in the code of realism. The story that Jean Louise is telling the readers has to feel as real as possible, so referring to moments of a pre-existing reality that belong to two decades with completely different conditions makes no sense. The solution for this problem is found in the first concept that was explored from Genette's theoretical proposal: analepsis. The author resolves in telling a story in the past sense, with a narrator that has full knowledge of how the events unfold and that is walking the paths of memory to trace the cause of her brother's injury. This way, any moment or experience that can be pointed at for historical inaccuracies can be explained by assuming it to be an anachronical addition that the narrator in the present, Jean Louise, is inserting. Patrick Chura recognises this phenomenon in the article discussed above and provides two examples of these anachronical events: first, the brief mention of the Works Progress Association (WPA) in chapter two when Atticus is explaining to his children Mr. Cunningham's economic status (Lee, 2002, p. 23), and second a quip that Mrs. Merriweather makes about Eleanor Roosevelt violating segregation law in chapter 24 (Lee, 2002, p. 267) (Chura, 2000, p. 1). The WPA was part of the New Deal, President Roosevelt's plan for financial recovery, but it was not set in motion until 1935, and the first chapters of *TKaM* are set in the summer of 1933, so Atticus could not have mentioned it to his children. Mrs. Roosevelt's controversial act of sitting with black members of the audience at the Southern Conference on

Human Welfare in Birmingham happened in 1938, while Aunt Alexandra's tea party with the town ladies was happening in 1935, so Mrs. Merriweather could not have criticised the First Lady's actions because they had not happened yet. These are small enough that they do not seem out of place and to a casual reader they do not pose much of a difference since they have little to no incidence in the story. This decision might have been deliberate, because in both cases the events are just mentioned and the years by which they are off in the timeline of the story are very few, which can be justified by thinking of them as a slight lapsus in Jean Louise's memory. She is recalling events from her childhood and makes comments about a federal organisation that was created two years later; she remembers it seemed normal to her. However, the inclusion of these small anachronistic events proposes to the audience a convention by which the novel can be read: as a story based on the memories of the narrator. Events can be shuffled and intertwined, the present of Scout's childhood can be infused with the present of Jean Louise's adulthood, along with the events she has already experienced and the knowledge she has already accumulated. This way of understanding the story and the construction of the novel is what makes up the subsequent narration that was explained in the first chapter and exemplified through an interaction between Scout and Miss Caroline that signals the interjection of Jean Louise and her adult voice. The inclusion of these interjection by the adult voice and the small events that are just out of place let the reader know that there are two points in time that are interacting constantly and, in doing so, create anachronisms that should be understood as consequences of the analeptical form and not mistakes in the creation of the setting.

Now, the way that the author portrays these events and interjections is what lets her create a conflict of the 1950s in the 1930s. The choice that she makes in terms of narrative time construction gives her the freedom to connect the civil rights period to the Great Depression while keeping the story plausible. By choosing two points in time, she can isolate parts from both of them and intertwine them to serve her evaluative ethical stand and aesthetic direction, and through this process, her aesthetic object unfolds in a time of its own, created only for its particular function. In the narration itself, the content that originates from the two periods can be discerned by the events that garner more attention by the protagonist-narrator. The first eight chapters of the novel, for example, introduce Scout's life. There are long passages about her relationships with Jem, Dill, Atticus, Calpurnia and others, descriptions of her home and her town, her experience going to school for the first time, and her obsession with Boo Radley. The sole focus of this section of the novel is

Scout's everyday experience in a small and poor town in the South of the United States, which is why the author can spend pages and pages describing her games with her friends, her aversion to school and her plans to lure her neighbour —whom she thinks is a monstrous and mysterious man— out of his confinement. It is not until chapter nine that any profound commentary about race is made, because for the first section of the novel, the racial tension of the 1950s that the author transforms is not yet introduced. Thus, the early 1930s as a cognitive instance in *TKaM* is recognisable in the moments where only Scout's child-like interests are in the forefront. In chapter nine the case assigned to Atticus is introduced and the focus changes because it has many effects that give way to introduce the conflicts of the mid-1950s. The retaliation from the community forces Atticus to discuss the specifics of the case with Scout, which leads her to new knowledge about racial prejudice, discrimination and systemic injustice. By way of the case, the introduction of conversations about segregation and white supremacy, like the ones that populated the South during the early Civil Rights Movement, start taking over and become Scout's new preoccupations. Throughout the rest of the novel, these two distinct pieces of content come in and out of the spotlight in intervals that respond to the need of the plot, which makes for a structure that includes both temporal times accordingly and transforms their ambiance, their tensions and their main characteristics to be able to include them in one fictional plane of existence.

A very clear example of how this structure works is by tracing the character of Arthur "Boo" Radley and the role he plays in the novel. He is a neighbour of the Finches who sparks the curiosity of the children because he is a recluse. All sorts of gossip surround his reluctance to come out of the house, so Jem, Scout and Dill are fascinated by the mystery of the man. In the first eight chapters of the novel he is central and comes up in almost every chapter because Scout is so enthralled by him that she is always thinking about him, designing plans to make him get out, imagining how he looks like and how he talks. After chapter nine he is suddenly not in Scout's priorities, so his appearances are much less frequent because the focus has shifted to Tom Robinson and the case. When the trial is over and the verdict proves to be fatal for Tom, the atmosphere of rejection that was created around Atticus and his family begins to fade and their lives go back to the sort of mundanity that was shown at the beginning. And with the turn-back, Boo Radley also returns in full swing because now the front of the stage is taken back by Scout. Therefore, her individual interests and worries get to be protagonists once again. When Scout is focusing on her mundane childhood, Boo Radley is present in her thoughts and the setting is again the 1930s, but when Scout

is focusing on the trial, the mysterious neighbour is not her main concern anymore and what is depicted is the confrontation of the 1950s placed in fictional Maycomb. Nevertheless, these settings are not strictly separated, they are continuously coming back and forth in between chapters, or malding into the same setting in some other chapters. This shows that the analeptical form and the subsequent narration technique that are applied are highly efficient in bringing those two periods of time together swiftly. Boo Radley's character can also account for this, because he never disappears from the novel; at times when he is not the focus, he is still roaming around in the back of Scout's mind, bringing a small part of that 1930s child-like feel into the heavy subject matters that are addressed in the chapters that cover the case more closely. The function that Boo Radley plays in the novel is emphasised even further at the end when the two worlds that Scout has been depicting collide: Bob Ewell attempts to kill Jem and Scout in retaliation for feeling humiliated by Atticus in court and it is Boo Radley who saves both of them. At that point, the depiction of the 50s with its surging violence and the echo of the 30s with its mundanity suddenly occupy the same space, and Scout is in the midst of both decades, in the middle of both worlds.

This way of closing the novel —the novel ends here because the struggle with Ewell is what causes Jem's arm injury, which is the story the narrator set out to tell in chapter one— is a great culmination of the use of the formal tools that the author used to aesthetisize the pre-existing reality that she chose because the two degrees of narration, Jean Louise in a present time and Scout in a past time, have been coming back and forth from a separate extradiegetic/metadiegetic relationship to a metalepses that includes intrusions from the first degree narrator, and here, in the closing pages, they come together through the protagonist-narrator in the same way both time periods do. This parallelism between the form and the content is very important to highlight because it means that in the setting of *TKaM*, Genette's narrative time and degrees, and Bakhtin's content are in absolute correspondence with each other. Exemplified in the previous analysis, the movements from the 1950s to the 1930s as cognitive instances in the novel are aided by the choice of displacing the narrative voice in time and applying the analeptical form to the storytelling. This carefully woven structure between form and content is not only present in the construction of the setting, but also in the other aesthetic process that was recognised in the previous chapter: the creation of a narrative voice that proposes a unique perspective. Boo Radley's character also fulfils a function in this process, specifically in the creation of the child narrator.

It was established that Boo Radley's presence in the spotlight is contingent with Scout's scope, because it is when she is focusing on the struggles and interests that are peculiar to a girl her age that he is the most present. Boo Radley keeps coming back in the novel not only because he is a marker of the author's 1930s Maycomb, but also because he is a marker of Scout's childhood and a reminder to the reader that all the story is being told from the perspective, albeit partially, of a seven-year-old girl. The way that this manifests in the novel is through the stark difference with which the children approach the character of Radley and how the adults do. Since the beginning of the novel, the readers are told that Jem, Scout and Dill are obsessed with their neighbour because their imagination has run wild about this man, partly due to the gossip around his mysterious figure and his reclusive nature, to the point that the description Jem gives to Dill the first time they are talking about Boo is not short of that of a horror monster:

> Jem gave a reasonable description of Boo: Boo was about six-and-a-half feet tall, judging from his tracks; he dined on raw squirrels and any cats he could catch, that's why his hands were blood-stained —if you ate an animal raw, you could never wash the blood off. There was a long jagged scar that ran across his face; what teeth he had were yellow and rotten; his eyes popped, and he drooled most of the time. (Lee, 2002, p. 14)

Not only is Jem creating this characterisation of their neighbour, Scout agrees and the author emphasises this by introducing the passage with "Jem gave a *reasonable* description of Boo", showing how both of the kids, and later Dill, choose Boo as the inspiration for a great part of their imaginative escapades that they believe possible. This man is a creation of the children, his monstrous qualities a hope that they might uncover something sinister or fantastic in their slow, old, lonely town. And for Scout, Boo is by far the most interesting person in Maycomb. The marvel with which the kids talk and fantasise about Boo is contrasted with the detached, disinterested and almost frustrated nature with which the adults refer to the young man. In chapter 4 the children are putting on plays in the yard and they decide to stage a scene they had heard through gossip about how Boo stabbed his father's leg with a pair of scissors. When Atticus gets home and sees them playing this scene, he sternly tells them that he hopes it is unrelated to the neighbour because he does not approve of these crazy ideas the youngsters have about him (p. 45). In chapter 5 Miss Maudie has a conversation with Scout about Boo and she is surprised at the young girl's interest in the man, specially when Scout asks if she thinks Boo is dead. When Miss Maudie answers that she is sure he is not because his corpse has not been carried out of the house, Scout returns that "Maybe

he died and they stuffed him up the chimney" (p. 48) —an idea that Jem had come up with— which is dismissed as silly and childish by the older woman. When Atticus finally catches the kids red handed trying to pass a note through the Radley's window at the end of the chapter, he expresses his disagreement with their games and says: "I'm going to tell you something and tell you one time: stop tormenting that man. That goes for the other two of you" (p. 54). What seems to the children like a fun mystery, a challenge, a game, seems to Atticus and Miss Maudie like torment, disrespect or foolishness. Scout still places Boo as the most interesting aspect of her life and town even after the experience she had with Tom Robinson's case and the trial. At the beginning of chapter 26, after the trial and Tom Robinson's brutal death, Scout is getting ready to go back to a new school year, which means she is going to have to walk past the Radley place every day. This reroutes her thoughts from Atticus' work back to her own life, and she wonders what it would be like to have a conversation with Boo (p. 278). This chapter is the first one since chapter 17 that does not include issues about the trial at its core, which means that, in the first chapter where the author is focusing solely on Scout's life again, Boo has a starring role. The first thought Scout turns back to when she can focus on herself again is Boo Radley, because she is a kid and that is where her imagination felt more alive, her priority is once again this character that she marvels so vehemently about. Boo's function as a marker of childhood is driven even further at this point in the novel because Jem, who is now eleven or twelve, thinks that he should start acting like an adult, and his new outlook results in him losing interest in Boo or any plan to lure the neighbour outside, leaving Scout, the only child left, to be the only one that does not forget Boo Radley.

The reason why it is important to highlight the ways that the author chooses to show her narrator's quality as a child is because the perspective that she builds is characterised by this defining quality. Having a child as the one who is telling these events is not a minimal detail and it influences the way all the story is understood. In the mid-50s, when Harper Lee was creating *TKaM,* children were conceived as small minds where thoughts were pure because Locke and Rosseau's definition of children was very current with the times, which means that her choice of making her narrator a child —even if it was not deliberate— carries these ideas into the aesthetic object; the pre-existing definition of childhood is transformed into content through the creation of the child narrator. The analysis made above of Boo Radley's incidence shows clearly how these two core ideas are transformed in the novel to define Scout's character. The beginning of chapter 26 alluded to before showcases the purity that was ascribed to children by redirecting Scout's attention to Boo

immediately after the dramatic climax of the story happens. Both the young girl and the audience have witnessed how frustrating, exasperating and devastating it is to realise that the world is not fair and that justice systems can be so corrupt; Scout has just seen how racial prejudice can be the defining factor in the fate of an innocent man, how death is one of the consequences of hate. Yet, her attention shifts almost immediately to Boo Radley, her imaginary monster. Scout is so innocent and so pure that as soon as she can think about the things she wants to —not forced to think about the trial due to her kinship with the defendant— she reverts to her child-like imaginations. Jem is once again an important contrast because he is supposed to be transitioning into an adult mind-set, and in doing so, he appears to be more affected by the trial and Tom Robinson's death, having an extreme emotional response that Scout does not understand — "I never wanta hear about that courthouse again, ever, ever, you hear me? You hear me? Don't you ever say one word to me about it again, you hear? Now go on!" (p. 283). This is not to say that Scout does not understand what happened or that she is indifferent to the situation, because the author makes it clear that the whole conflict affects her and elicits reflective and critical thinking —like the questions about Hitler, hate and the racist comments Miss Gates makes after the trial, which is what Jem finds upsetting enough to say what was quoted above— but it is a testament of how these conceptions of children's minds that come from a pre-existing reality bleed into the characterisation of the second degree narrator: she returns to the games and the fond foolishness of youth after such a heavy experience, she turns back to her innocence and her purity of mind right after witnessing the extreme corruption that rules the system she lives in.

Now, the author does not leave the child outlook limited to her world and mind alone, she makes her innocence play along with other characters and be influential in the decisions these characters make. She does this constantly, and most of the time, the way Scout looks at a situation is contrasted with the way the adults around her do to in order to emphasise how different the seven-year-old's approach is. One of the most impactful moments where this construction is evident is in the core scene in chapter 15, because it is a turning point for the story that shows how persuasive Scout's point of view can be. This moment happens a couple of days before the trial, when Tom Robinson is in Maycomb County jail (pp. 164-176). The chapter begins in the Finch's home where they are having supper. Then, Mr. Heck Tate and a crowd of other men speak to Atticus outside the house, and he takes the car to go downtown. He plans to sit outside the jail because Heck and the others warned him that some folk might try to go into the building and lynch Tom. Jem, Scout and Dill

go to the town square due to a suspicion that Jem said he felt about the whole situation; Atticus did not tell the kids what Mr. Tate and the others shared, nor did he inform them about what he was planning to do. They get close enough to see four cars driving towards the place where Atticus had set up one of his office chairs and a lightbulb, right outside the front door, and see some men coming out of the cars walking towards Atticus. What follows is a very tense interaction between these men and Atticus, which seems to be escalating until Scout runs up to meet her father, with Jem and Dill behind her. Atticus asks Jem to take the other two back home, but he declines and the men begin to get impatient, ordering Atticus to get the kids out of there. Things are tense once again and do not seem to be moving towards a peaceful resolution when Scout recognises Mr. Cunningham in the crowd of men:

> "Hey, Mr. Cunningham."
>
> The man did not hear me it seemed.
>
> "Hey, Mr. Cunningham. How's your entailment getting' along?"
>
> […]
>
> "Don't you remember me, Mr. Cunningham? I'm Jean Louise Finch. You brought us some hickory nuts one time, remember?" I began to sense the futility one feels when unacknowledged by a chance acquaintance.
>
> "I go to school with Walter," I began again. "He's your boy, ain't he? Ain't he sir?"
>
> Mr. Cunningham was moved to a faint nod. He did know me, after all.
>
> "He's in my grade," I said, "and he does right well. He's a good boy," I added, "a real nice boy. We brought him home for dinner one time. Maybe he told you about me, I beat him up but he was real nice about it. Tell him hey for me, won't you?" (Lee, 2002, p. 174)

After Scout's intervention, the situation slowly starts to calm down, resulting in the gang of men leaving the lawyer and the three kids alone, abandoning their violent attempt. The author is ambiguous in her description of Cunningham's surrender, so there is no clear answer as to why Scout changed his mind. It could have been something pragmatic, like he just did not want to inflict brutal violence when three children were right there, when he and the others were about to murder a man inside the building. However, what Scout says to Mr. Cunningham suggests that his surrender had a different reason. The sincerity with which she tries to connect with him through

the only person they both know, Walter, seems to shake this man because it feels like Scout has no idea what they are there for and is just trying her best to be polite to a man that has been nice to her in the past, while he is standing there with a bat about to beat a man, who has not even been proved guilty yet, to death. Scout acts like a mirror to reveal to Mr. Cunningham the dimension of what he is about to do; the way she sees him is pure because her knowledge about him guide her to believe that he is a good man and it is only when, through her mundane request of sending regards to his son, she allows him to notice this, that he seems to realise that he might not want to be somebody different from who Scout sees. This seven-year-old does not seem to know that she deescalated a situation that was going to end up in homicide; she was just trying to be nice. That slight unawareness in her nature, that naivety, seems to be what influenced a gang of riled up men to abstain from their plan. The scene becomes even more transcendental since it was because of Scout that Tom Robinson was able to get to the trial and have a chance, albeit minimal, to be acquitted. She is the reason why he at least gets to sit in the courthouse and fight for his innocence, at least gets to be judged in the open and gets to verbalise his part of the story publicly. Had she not intervened, that gang that Mr. Cunningham was a part of would have beat Tom to death and his case would have ended in a dark cell by the hands of white revenge, similar to the way the Emmett Till's murder happened. Through Scout's innocent and child-like mindset, the author gives a sort of renewed justice to the lynching cases that were common during the Civil Rights era in the way of preventing an extrajudicial fate to be the end of Tom Robinson's story. This shows how the choice of a child narrator and protagonist leads to an ethical evaluative perspective that is going to comment, reflect, question and influence the ethical stands of other actants in the novel.

The child-narrator and the qualities attributed to her due to the pre-existing notions about her nature, however important, are just a part of the narrative voice in *TKaM*; Scout is the second degree narrator, but there is another voice in this construction that was recognised as the first degree narrator and labelled as Jean Louise, the adult version of the seven-year-old who is at some point in time after the events that the novel narrates and is reminiscing about this interval of her childhood. This Genettian autobiographical form adds a new layer of complexity to the construction of the novel because there is an abysmal difference between reading the novel through the eyes of a child and reading it through the eyes of an adult that is looking back at her own memories. The first way of reading it means that what Scout describes and reflects about have to be taken at face value because this is the way she is reacting to a new experience; she is sharing

her genuine reactions. But the second way of reading it signals to a careful consideration that ocurred between the moment of the experience and the moment when the experience is being remembered and narrated. The main and most important difference between the two is that Jean Louise has already lived through the events that Scout is telling the audience about, meaning that her outlook about said events is now more knowledgeable, more mature, more pondered. This happens because the author chooses to dissect the narrative voice and have this person —Scout and Jean Louise— at two different points in time telling the same story, constituting that autobiographical form that was explored before: one of the parts of the narrative voice is extradiegetic, outside the time of the story, and the other part is metadiegetic, inside the story. The extradiegetic narrator is in a position to recount her own memories in the fashion she deems best, which means that she has the capacity to edit her childhood depending on her intentions. This is the most relevant aspect of this displaced narrative voice: Jean Louise has an intention that, even though it is never addressed directly, it influences the way the story is told, the way the characters are portrayed, and the way the conflict is constructed.

The most prominent example of this phenomenon is found in the characterisation of Atticus. As pointed out in prior studies, the character of Atticus Finch, being close to flawless, is a direct consequence of the narrative voice, because it is this perspective that glorifies him (Ako-Adjei, 2017; Henninger, 2016; Eaton, 2017; Pond, 2017). Jean Louise is Atticus' daughter, so it makes sense that in telling this story she would want her father to be seen in a good light. It is important to accept that his depiction comes from someone who loves and admires him, someone who looked up to him and who thought he was the best person she knew. Through her eyes, Atticus excels in all the facets of his life: he is a great father, a great neighbour and a great lawyer. He is a widow who is raising his children with the help of Calpurnia; he did not run away after his wife died and is trying to the best of his abilities to build a good family structure around his kids. He plays with his children—as much as his age allows it—, reads to them and treats them with respect. These traits might not seem impressive at first, but as the novel progresses and fathers such as the cold and absent Mr. Radley or the violent Bob Ewell, Atticus' quiet, gentle, and compromised manner becomes more admirable. The relationship portrayed between Atticus and his kids is central to his depiction, and the way it is shown also elicits feelings of appreciation because he seems to always be fair and respectful. For example, in chapter two, Scout has a disastrous first day of school which includes her being nagged, hit with a ruler, forbidden from reading at home and grounded by her

teacher, Miss Caroline. This upsets her enough to tell her father that she does not want to go back to school. Rather than nagging her and using his authority to justify himself, Atticus explains why he cannot teach her, why it is important to go and how to become somebody more empathetic towards her new teacher. He also bargains with her and they get to a compromise: they will keep reading together even if Miss Caroline does not approve of it, if she keeps attending school (pp. 32-35). Throughout all this exchange Atticus does not yell or humiliate Scout once. Instead, he listens to her, lets her speak her mind, and answers by giving full arguments and explanations, which leads toward an amicable and logical resolution of the problem for both parties. This approach is obvious again when Atticus explains to Scout why he took the case in chapter nine, by using clear language and appeasing her doubts about the honour of a lawyer who defends black people (pp. 86-87), or when he asks Jem to apologise to Mrs. Dubose for ruining her garden and accept whichever conditions she deems fit to settle the issue. In this last case, he asks Jem about the reason for his actions and listens to him, while also telling him that it is unacceptable that he would cause trouble to such and ill and old woman (p. 119-121). Again, during this whole scene he does not scream or berate Jem but instead asks him calmly to apologise while showing him why his actions where wrong. He is open to communication and respects his children enough so as to consider their point of view; he never dismisses them or treats them as less. This approach to his children is extrapolated in later chapters like 17 and 18 when the trial is taking place, because Atticus is never shown being disrespectful, dismissive or belligerent towards Bob Ewell or his daughter, even when they are reacting with hostility. Mayella even accuses him of mocking her by referring to her as “ma’am” or “Miss Mayella” and it is Judge Taylor who has to explain that “[it is] just Mr. Finch’s way […] We’ve done business in this court for years and years, and Mr. Finch is always courteous to everybody. He’s not trying to mock you, he’s trying to be polite. That is just his way” (p. 207). These are just a few moments where the lawyer’s character is at the forefront and his traits are showcased, and in every single one he is always right and always good. It is clear that his figure is meant to be understood as heroic, which means that the moments in the story in which he participates are chosen precisely to make this image believable. Jean Louise seems to be purposefully including events that can support the exemplary notion of Atticus, describing them in a manner that directs the narrator to look up to him the way she did when she was seven. And because she is at a point in time when she can reflect on her memories, she is able to find the

moments that can best build the persona she has chosen for Atticus, leaving out any conflict that might stain his personality.

In terms of the cognitive instance of the mid-1950s and the content, the decision of including a first degree narrator provides an opportunity to present the conflicts through a complex lens that can make two critical comments at the same time. By way of Scout's metadiegetic narrator, nuanced conceptions or events can be devolved to their core ideas because her young brain is trying to understand them, so she proceeds to simplify them in order to do so. But, at the same time, Jean Louise is reflecting on this process that her past self was going thorugh, which means that she can make comments or present an opinion about these issues, veiled behind Scout's pondering. For example, when Scout's teacher, Miss Gates, brings up the concept of democracy to a session and vehemently criticises Hitler's actions on the basis of prejudice, she seems confused and decides to go to Jem for answers:

> "Miss Gates is a nice lady, ain't she?"
>
> "Why sure," said Jem, "I liked her when I was in her room."
>
> "She hates Hitler a lot…"
>
> "What's wrong with that?"
>
> "Well, she went on today about how bad it was him treatin' the Jews like that. Jem, it's not right to persecute anybody, is it? I mean have mean thoughts about anybody, even, is it?"
>
> "Gracious no, Scout, What's eatin' you?"
>
> "Well, coming out of the courthouse that night Miss Gates was —she was goin' down the steps in front of us, you musta not seen her— she was talking with Miss Stephanie Crawford. I heard her say it's time somebody taught 'em a lesson, they were getting' way above themselves, an' the next thing they can do is marry us. Jem, how can you hate Hitler so bad an' them turn around and be ugly about folks right at home—" (Lee, 2022, pp. 282, 283)

In this passage the author reveals Scout's innocence and Jean Louise's adult revision by having the child ask questions that seem to be simple and ordinary, but that could have not happened without a deep critical musing about the issue at hand. Scout's comparison and conclusion seem to be a big leap from just one school lesson, which can point to a metaleptical lapsus in which Jean Louise is stepping in to insert her own perspective in the thoughts of her past self. This way the author

comments two different things: first, through the naïve eyes of a child, Miss Gates beliefs are stripped to their essentials, and Scout concludes that they do not make sense; second, through the experienced eyes of an adult, Jean Louise recognises that Miss Gates was just a hypocritical racist, and that the same arguments she used to condemn Nazi ideology worked just fine to justify the unfair outcome of a black man's trial. Through this double narrative voice construction, the author has the chance to point out the absurdity of racial prejudice from the innocence of a girl who just finds that certain values that structure her surroundings do not add up, to the experienced opinion of an adult woman who understands that those beliefs that seem off are deliberately ignored in certain discourses by the people who justify them. Here is when the author's ethical evaluation stand can be difficult to dissociate from the one that Jean Louise seems to be presenting, and the aesthetic object seems to be closer to the cognitive instance more than ever, because even though they are talking about Hitler's fascist uprising in 1934, the quip that Miss Gates pronounces—"they were getting' way above themselves, an' the next thing they can do is marry us"— codifies one of the main fears of the new desegregation laws that were decreed in 1954, namely, the mixing of the races.

There is one last important process that is evident when both Genette and Bakhtin's proposals are applied to the construction of the narrative perspective, and which determines the completion of what the Russian theorist named the architectonic form. The architectonic form is achieved through the structured connection of the compositional form —which has been explained in detail through this study— with the content that includes an ideological perspective. The ideological perspective refers to the ethical assessment, the opinion that an author has about the issues they chose to create their work, the commentary that they make about the world in their artistic endeavour, and it is the only way these pre-existing realities can be fully aesthetisised in the content. In *TKaM*, this ideological perspective can be recognised specifically through the choice of the narrative voice structure, that has two specific characteristics that determine this assessment: it is at the same time the point of view of a child and an adult, who is a white woman witnessing and remembering a case of racial prejudice in the Deep South. These traits have been explored in detail throughout the paper, but it is imperative to understand the way they realise the author's ideological perspective and the ethical evaluative stand she is proposing. This is where Genette's tools are once again very useful, because he conceptualised the ideological function, which accounts for the relationship — ethical, intellectual, or emotional— the author establishes with their creative work, and that was

briefly discussed in the first chapter. Genette proposes that there is an opinion, a belief that the author conveys through their artistic form that can be pointed out by describing this function in the narration. The quote that was explored before, when Scout intervenes in the violent plans of Mr. Cunningham and the other men, is very telling of the ideology that the author is putting forward. It was mentioned that, if it was not for Scout's intervention, Tom Robinson would have been killed in that cell and he would not have been able to take his case to court. The seven-year-old is an active part of the justice system, even if she is not a lawyer or a judge, because it was her child-like innocent approach that changed the plans of the white mob and let Tom have a chance at real justice. Even if she was not entirely conscious about it, she was exercising her status as a white child, daughter of a respected man in Maycomb, to defend a black man. The choice of placing Scout in the middle of this tense situation is ideologically functional, because it is expressing the author's conception of white power and how it can turn around situations of injustice and violence; it is Scout, the white child protagonist, who in that moment is more decisive than Atticus, Heck Tate or Judge Taylor. The scene that the author constructs is placing the weight of justice in the hands of a person who has no power in the system directly —unlike her father, the chief of police or the judge— who is not even intending to defend the black man, and she is still the one who changes Tom Robinson's fate. The ideological perspective that underlies this choice is the consciousness of white power, which even in the most unlikely hands, influences the outcomes of racist prejudice cases and can be the only saving grace for a black person who is subdued to an unfair environment, just like Tom Robinson. As a white woman, the author is reflecting about her responsibility in the growing tensions of the early Civil Rights Movement, her role as somebody that had power even if she did not ask for it. Like Scout, she too is decisive because she is white in a system that has at its core white supremacy; her voice is listened if only because of the colour of her skin and above all the clamours of black citizens, and through her novel she is depicting just how powerful this white voice is. It is important to note that Scout seems not to know just how impactful her voice is, because through this characterisation the author is suggesting that white individuals have no idea how their system favours them so evidently and they do not know that just taking action might change the course of racial injustice. This ideology portrayed through the confrontation of chapter 15 is the reason why some critics (Ako-Adjei, 2017) have pointed out that *TKaM* is a white saviour narrative, a story where black characters have no incidence and are only vehicles by which the white characters are shown to be heroes, specifically Atticus and Scout. This

kind of interpretation is possible because the ideological perspective that the author is proposing is placing this white power in the centre, depicting the weight that a white person's actions and opinions can have on black people's fate, especially someone who is does not occupy a position of power in the big systems that oppress minorities; the common, unknowing, and seemingly small white has a role in the wide racist structure and is always exercising power. The author chooses to bring forth this influence by way of her protagonist-narrator, who, through her naïve attempt at politeness, gives a condemned black man a second chance.

The narrative voice is ideologically justified in another example that has been discussed prior, and this time the ideological perspective is pushing further than white power to propose how racism in the United States was illogical and hypocritical. When Scout ponders about Miss Gates' beliefs —since she condemned Hitler for his prejudice and praised the jury's verdict in Tom Robinson's case— she reveals in just a couple of lines of dialogue how the conception of racial prejudice in the United States was crafted around hate, even if the perpetrators tried to justify their actions as objective and fair. The authorial decision to include a comparison with Nazi Germany functions ideologically as way to place a mirror in which the protagonist-narrator can see her own community and ask herself a complicated question: what makes the people of Maycomb, good people like Miss Gates, different from Nazis if they also lead themselves and their systems with hate? This query has an answer because of the double narrative voice, because while Scout is asking, Jean Louise is answering. It seems that the author gives the child a hint of the answer to have the adult —a much more experienced and knowledgeable woman— confirm that, in fact, there is no difference. The ideology proposed through this comparison is overtly antiracist, pointing out how ridiculous and idiotic the excuses that people like Miss Gates used were to justify white supremacy. Placing southern racists at the same level as Nazi Germans, who were thought of as mad, senseless, and violent, is done deliberately so that the author, through her double protagonist-narrator, can comment on the hypocrisy of United States' citizens regarding their own prejudiced systems. For the author, for Scout and for Jean Louise, it is not possible for someone to denounce Hitler and be racist, it is absolutely illogical. This stark criticism, along with the commentary about white power explained before, reveals an ideological perspective codified in *TKaM* that advocates for antiracism as the only reasonable political and ethical stand to take, especially by a white individual, to be able to face racial injustice and its acting systems in the United States, proposed at a time when so many tried to dismiss the cause for equality.

The processes that were described and exemplified in this section show the importance and the influence of the choices Harper Lee made in terms of narrative voice structure. The convergence of the two time periods into one narrative time, the tension between the separate narrators and the metaleptical transgressions, the construction of the two narrative voices and how they impact the story, and the weaving of the ideological perspective into this voice construction, all amount to the structure that makes *TKaM* such a complex and well created novel. If the voice had not been structured in this manner, through these specific formal tools that the author chose, the outcome would have lost the innocent outlook and the critical revision that make this narrative perspective so special, which leads to the events that are depicted to be less thought-provoking. This is one of the reasons why the sequel to *TKaM*, *Go Set a Watchman*, was so harshly criticised. Even though it is a story about the same young woman in the Deep South, who describes a relationship with her father, and who makes critical comments about racial injustice —with most of the cognitive instances that were chosen for *TKaM*, the early Civil Rights Movement in the 1950s— the feeling that this new novel elicits changes because the structure is completely reelaborated. There is no cross-historical montage, so there is no way to escape the crudity of the 1950s; the narrator is an omniscient third person, so the opinion that permeates the depiction of the characters and events is less discernible; the narration is at times focalised, but it is always done with adult characters, so there is no innocence, just disillusionment. The bright Scout in *GSaW* is gone, and the novel is left with only a Jean Louise that must face harsh truths about her community, her family and herself with no one else to shine a light.

Conclusion

TKaM is a mirage. Even though it has been recognised for its themes and admired for its depictions, the elaboration of complex structures that condense form and content in the novel are often overlooked. As evidenced in the State of the Art, the critical analysis around the novel often poses questions in the thematic realm, mostly about the *why* and the *what* of racial prejudice, children, civil rights, or white supremacy. The *how* is dismissed because it seems like there is not much intricacy in this question given that the novel appears to have a very standard structure. *TKaM* is a mirage as it seems simple and direct, but a closer look reveals that the formal tools used and the way the content is realised are the most impressive part of the novel.

The novel exhibits an array of formal tools that are used in the aesthetisation process that the cognitive instances go through. It starts with one decision: to have a split narrative voice, Scout as a child in the past and Jean Louise as an adult in the present. From there on, Genettian nomenclature guides the detailed manner in which these forms are present in the novel. By looking into the workings of the double voice, the cross-historicism of the setting and the transgressive tone in which Scout's thoughts are verbalised are no longer considered as mistakes; the first decision of having two points in time, two perspectives that come together to build one narrative voice account for all the small details that might seem off because it is supposed to communicate the revision excercise that Jean Louise is doing while telling this story. This knowledge revolutionises the way the aesthetic object is understood, because now the ambiguity around who is talking and which period of time the reader is supposed to be focusing on —an ambiguity that seems deliberately included by the author to veil the nature of the narrative voice— is dispelled and there is an open stage to be able to see the inner workings of the novel.

The recognition of the form gives way to see the function of several characters and events that were difficult to understand at first. The importance of Boo Radley as a character before the recognition can be attributed to childish imaginations and wonderings that have no importance, but after understanding his function as a marker of Scout's narrative perspective and as a way to emphasize her qualities as a child, his inclusion is imperative to understand the whole novel. The movement from the 1930s setting to the 1950s setting can be misinterpreted as a flaw in the author's construction or a senseless anachronism just so she could insert her present in her fiction, but when

the two voices are considered, the conception of two historical eras and their transformation to occupy the same space in the novel make perfect sense; the cross-historical amalgam allows the reader to perceive the naivety of Scout's life and the tension of her surroundings at the same time, while separating them enough so that they can be distinguished. Even though an incredibly nuanced aesthetic object is created, a lot of the times the newfound knowledge leads to more questions than answers. That is the case of Jean Louise's influence in the depiction of Atticus, because on one hand, understanding the narrative voice shows that this Atticus is glorified and idealised, and his character can be approached from a critical point of view, but on the other hand, this realisation means that this Atticus cannot be considered sincere. The awareness that results from being able to understand and visualize the creative scaffolds of the novel leads to clarity, but also to disillusionment. Scout's child qualities can also be approached with this new sense of understanding, and in doing so, certain questions about her purity and innocence arise; now it is obvious that the girl from the novel is not only a seven-year-old, but a seven-year-old as told by her older, more mature, more experienced, more knowledgeable self.

The analyses included in this paper serve the purpose of breaking that illusion that *TKaM* is simple, that it lacks depth and that its value resides only on the topics that make up its conflicts. As revealed through this entire study, the intricacies of this novel are plenty, and they are consequences of the choices that the author made; choices of narrative time and narrative person that bring a new meaning to the story, the characters, the conflict, the ideological perspective and the interaction with the aesthetic object. These decisions are influential and they are deliberate, and looking at them in detail opens up the novel by revealing its structure. And, at the same time that the novel is opening up, it is getting more and more complex, the careful weaving of the form, the content, the perspectives, the intentions, revealed in a new light; new questions about justice, about racism, about prejudice, about children come up and new answers are awaiting in this symphony, in this choir, in this tale of voices.

Bibliography

Ako-Adjei, Naa Baako. (2017). Why It's Time Schools Stopped Teaching *To Kill a Mockingbird*. *Transition*, (122), 182. https://doi.org/10.2979/transition.122.1.24

Armstrong, R. (2010). Mockingbird Lessons: Novel and Film. In *Bloom's Guides: To Kill a Mockingbird* (pp. 66–70). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Bajtín, M. (1989). El problema del contenido el material y la forma en el arte verbal. In *Teoría y estética de la novela*. Trabajos de investigación (pp. 13–75). Madrid: Taurus.

Best, R. H. (2011). Panopticism and the Use of "the Other" in *To Kill a Mockingbird*. *Mississippi Quarterly*, *62*(3–4), 541–552.

Chura, P. (2000). Prolepsis and Anachronism: Emmet Till and the Historicity of *To Kill a Mockingbird*. The Southern Literary Journal, 32(2), 1–26.

Chura, P. (2010). The Historical Conditions of the Novel. In *Bloom's Guides: To Kill a Mockingbird* (pp. 48–55). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Cleverly, J., & Phillips, D.C. (1986). *Visions of Childhood. Influential Models from Locke to Spock.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Eaton, K. (2017). Mockingbird, Watchman, and the Adolescent. *Mississippi Quarterly*, *70/71*(3), 335–354.

Genette, G. (1980). *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (Vol. 3). New York: Cornell University Press.

Henninger, K. (2016). My Childhood is Ruined!": Harper Lee and Racial Innocence. *American Literature*, *88*(3), 597–626. https://doi.org/10.1215/00029831-3650259

Kehily, M. J. (2004). Understanding Childhood: An Introduction to Some Key Themes and Issues. In M. J. Kehily (Ed.), *An Introduction to Childhood Studies* (pp. 1–23). New York: Open University Press.

Lee, H. (2002). *To Kill a Mockingbird*. New York: HarperCollins.

Lee, H. (2015). *Go Set a Watchman*. New York: HarperCollins.

Murray, J. (2010). More Than One Way to (Mis) Read a "Mockingbird". *Southern Literary Journal*, *43*(1), 75–91.

Piaget, J. (1975). *Seis estudios de psicología*. Barcelona: Seix Barral.

Pond, J. (2017). No One Likes to Feel Like an Adolescent: Genre Resistance in Harper Lee's Novels. *Mississippi Quarterly*, *70*(1), 81–103. https://doi.org/10.1353/mss.2017.0000

Remini, R. V. (2008). *A Short History of the United States*. New York: HarperCollins.

Saney, I. (2010). Racism in To Kill a Mockingbird. In *Bloom's Guides: To Kill a Mockingbird* (pp. 58–63). New York: Infobase Publishing.

Shackelford, D. (1996). The Female Voice in "To Kill a Mockingbird": Narrative Strategies in Film and Novel. *The Mississippi Quarterly*, *50*(1), 101.

Ware, M. S. (2010). Influences on Scout's Childhood. In *Bloom's Guides: To Kill a Mockingbird* (pp. 63–66). New York: Infobase Publishing.