

THE LABYRINTH OF LANGUAGE AND NARRATOR CHAIN IN EMILY BRONTE'S WUTHERING HEIGHTS

Abdol Hossein Joodaki¹, Sonia Sarvipour²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Lorestan, Khorramabad (IRAN)

²Ph.D in English Literature, Educated from University of Pune, Pune (INDIA)

E-mails: joodaki367@yahoo.com, sarvipour@yahoo.com

DOI: 10.7813/jll.2013/4-2/5

ABSTRACT

Any fiction, as an example of a narrative genre, is saturated with colors, gestures, and sounds; in fact, the main concern of narration is language. For Foucault and Lacan language is the primary object studied by psychoanalysis or discourse theory. While Foucault concentrates on definitions such as discourse and truth to elaborate language, Lacan focuses on notions such as symbolic order, the real order, and subject. In any case, both critics see language primarily as a mediating element that permits the subject to attain recognition of his world. The function of narrative as a chain is the same as labyrinth. By considering locking and being locked as an important feature of labyrinth, this study attempts to make an analogy of these concepts with language and the chain of narrators in Emily Bronte's masterpiece *Wuthering Heights*. Through Lacan and Foucault's theoretical assumptions, it will find how the chain of narrative as a discourse are created through characters' narrations and locks them in such a way that any escapes is impossible.

Key words: labyrinth, narrator chain, symbolic order, Lacan, Emily Bronte

1. INTRODUCTION

Although any fiction, as an example of a narrative genre, is saturated with colors, gestures, and sounds, in fact the main concern of narration is language. Language is not a means to prescribe, command, or teach a topic. However, it is the primary structure that the author uses to narrate or tell a story in which all of items may be found in such a way that it is quite difficult to imagine clear-cut boundaries or barriers to result in the production of a pure fictive work. Classical thinkers believed that language could have no "fundamental role in knowledge. Language could be nothing more than a higher order instrument of thought: a physical representation of ideas, having no meaning except in relation to them" (Gutting, 2013). Modern views were "developed by making ideas essentially tied to language (as in, for example, Herder), now regarded as the primary (and historicized) vehicle of knowledge;" in this view, "modern thought makes knowledge essentially historical" (ibid).

V. V. Nalimov (1981) refers to postmodern attitudes on the notion of language as he asserts:

Looking back on his marvelously creative years, Albert Einstein exclaimed "... the eternal mystery of the world is its comprehensibility." One might add to this the observation that the eternal mystery of the history of human culture is the capacity of human beings to capture so many aspects of the world by means of man-made symbols, including that extraordinary artifact—language! (p. xi)

In this regard, one is inclined to the most distinguished postmodern thinkers such as Michel Foucault and Jacques Lacan. For Lacan language is considered "primarily as a mediating element which permits the subject to attain recognition from the other." Lacanian "language is first and foremost an appeal to an interlocutor; in Jakobson's terms, Lacan stresses the connotative function above the referential." Accordingly, "all human communication is inscribed in a linguistic structure" and "the whole aim of psychoanalytic treatment is to articulate the truth of one's desire in speech rather than in any other medium" (Evans, 2006, p. 91). Foucauldian poststructuralist theory teaches us to be very attentive to small shifts in how ideas are expressed in language. Language, for Foucault, as well as other forms of symbolic exchange, is the primary object studied by discourse theory. Language can