

A Comparative Study of First-Person Narrative Technique in Four Amharic Novels

A Thesis Presented to
The School of Graduate Studies
Addis Ababa University

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree Master of Arts in
Literature (English)

By

Hailu Abebe

June, 2001

Addis Ababa

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

A Comparative Study of First-Person Narrative Technique in Four Amharic Novels

By

Hailu Abebe

Approved by Board of Examiners:

Abise Daniel

Advisor

Abise

Signature

ZERAYDIN ASFAW

Examiner

Zeraydin Asfaw

Signature

Berhaneu Matthews

Examiner

Berhaneu Matthews

Signature

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all I would like to give thanks and honour to my redeemer, Lord Jesus Christ, who gave me a chance to learn and accomplish my study. Next, my dear adviser Dr. Abyie Daniel takes my great thanks for his willingness to advise me, and for the constructive ideas he has rendered to the betterment and development of this paper. The other man whom I would like to thank very well is Associate Professor, and Dean of ILS, Ato Zerihun Asfaw, who gave me ideas on the topic and advised me how to work on it.

Again I would like to pass my heartfelt gratitude to my boss, Ato Tesfaye Abrha and to my colleague Lt. Yared Melese, for the favour they have shown, at the beginning and during my study years.

My thanks also go to my heartily felt friend Mesfin Mesele, who has been at my side in giving moral support during my study.

Of course, I am indebted to my family and other friends who have given me moral and material support during my education.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my instructors Dr. Akalu Getaneh and Dr. Berhanu Mathewos for their moral support.

Abstract

The main objective of this paper is to examine the first-person narrative technique. In fact, this technique is not seen used frequently by novel writers in general. According to the assessment of this researcher, Amharic, novels that shows this technique are few in number. Therefore, this study takes this phenomenon as its very reason and research problem to be examined.

To identify the causes why authors do not use frequently the first-person narrative technique in their works (novels), as well as to sort out the advantages and disadvantages of this method of story telling, this research has been made on four known Ethiopian authors' first-person novels.

The writers are Negashi G/Mariam, Wondimu Negashi, Hailemeleket Mawale, and Bealu Girma. And their works are: Settegnān Adari, Enbutte Tsigerida, Yewedianesh and Oromay respectively.

By reading these novels thoroughly, and comparing the talent of each writer in using the first-person narrative technique, an attempt has been made to distinguish and set out the causes, why authors do not used the technique frequently. Along with it, the advantages and disadvantages of this technique are examined.

As it is observed in this study, the main reason for authors not to use first-person narrative technique frequently is the nature of the method. Its nature does not allow a free and a flexible movement for the authors to direct their stories as they could. Of course, there is a narrator who stands as a person and tells the story; hence, there is no chance for the author to tell about the events and actions which are beyond the knowledge, vision and reach of this narrator. Again the vision of this narrator as well the technique is very limited. To overcome the limitations and to use the technique effectively, it is essential to draw properly the first-person narrator, or to use other narrative techniques in combination with the first-person narrative technique.

As it is reviewed in this study among the authors whose works are compared and examined here, Bealu Girma has applied other narrative techniques to alleviate the problem that his first-person narrator faces. Therefore, in his work a wavering of point of view is observed. He uses an omniscient point of view and narrator. By doing so, he could overcome the limitations that face his first-person narrator.

In general from this study, certain major things have been learned and reached. The most important are these: when a story is presented in the first-person narrative technique, we need to draw the narrator properly. Again, to overcome the limitations that the first-person narrator faces a changing of point of views from one type (kind) to the other, or a combination of them (first-person + objective + omniscient etc.) is possible as Bealu Girma does in his novel, Oromay.

In fact, as it is shown in this research, to gain the advantages of the first-person narrative technique and to use it more effectively, wavering of point of view is very important. Shifting from one angle to the other enables one to tell a story, without limitations. Therefore Bealu's style of presenting a story with "mixed point of view" is recommended for Ethiopian writers to use. Ethiopian novel writers should develop and learn to use it since it is a flexible, attractive and vivid style.

Table of Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | i |
| ABSTRACT | ii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | iv- vi |
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1. Purpose of the Study | 3 |
| 1.2. Significance of the Study | 3 |
| 1.3. Scope of the Study | 4 |
| 1.4. Review of Related Literature | 4 |
| CHAPTER TWO: NARRATIVE, NARRATOR AND POINT OF VIEW | 11 |
| 2.1. Narrative | 11 |
| 2.2. Narrator | 14 |
| 2.3. Point of View | 18 |
| 2.3.1. Omniscient Point of View | 21 |
| 2.3.2. Limited Omniscient Point of View | 23 |
| 2.3.3. Objective Point of View | 25 |
| 2.3.4. First-Person Point of View | 26 |

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| CHAPTER THREE: THE NOVELS /SYNOPSIS/ | 29 |
| 3.1 Settegñña Adari | 29 |
| 3.2 Enbutte Tsigerida | 33 |
| 3.3 Yewedianesh | 38 |
| 3.4 Oromay | 43 |
| | |
| CHAPTER FOUR: FEATURES EXHIBITED AND TECHNIQUES USED IN THE NARRATIVES (<u>Settegñña Adari</u>, <u>Enbutte Tsigerida</u>, <u>Yewedianesh</u> and <u>Oromay</u>) | 50 |
| 4.1 Features in <u>Settegñña Adari</u> | 50 |
| 4.2 Features in <u>Enbutte Tsigerida</u> | 53 |
| 4.3 Features in <u>Yewedianesh</u> | 56 |
| 4.4 Features in <u>Oromay</u> | 58 |
| 4.5 Narrative Techniques Reflected in the Novels | 59 |
| 4.5.1 Description and Dialogue | 60 |
| 4.5.2 Flash Back and Foreshadowing | 67 |
| 4.5.3 Epistolary and Telephone Method | 73 |
| | |
| CHAPTER FIVE: NARRATORS | 80 |
| 5.1 Inanu Agonafer | 80 |
| 5.2 Mestawat Teshale | 97 |
| 5.3 Getaneh Yeayehyerad | 107 |
| 5.4 Tsegaye Hailemariam | 116 |
| | |
| CONCLUSION | 123 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 127 |

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Whenever authors write their novels, they have their own individual targets to hit. Of course, when they enter into such a writing process, it is expected and imagined that, through their writings they have the intention of passing a certain message, or they would say something important to their readers.

Indeed, to do so they have to build, or create a certain bridge, or medium which would carry their stories (messages) to be handed out to the readers. It is obligatory or essential to them to characterize a certain representative who will stand between them and their readers and communicate their stories. In other words, they have to draw their fiction world communicator.

This communicator, in the literary world is known as a narrator, or a storyteller. So, when the issue of a narrator is raised, the issue of “point of view” will be immediately raised too. This is because when an author intends to tell a certain story he has to select and indicate his “stand point”. Therefore, the issue of point of view or the angle through which the author tells his story will be a very important decision to make. “Who” tells the story, “how” and “why” it is told are very important issues in the fiction world. Why this is important? A literary woman Hawthorn (1985: 64-65) states this as follows:

... in every day life “who” tells us a story, and “how” make a very big difference. The statement that the economy has never been stronger has a different effect on us if told by the Prime Minister from the effect it has on us if we read it in an opposition newspaper. ... source and medium affect the selection, the authority, and the attitude towards what is recounted of the narrative — and thus of course, the effect on the reader or listener.

According to Hawthorn's suggestion, the angle, or the source, or the point of view, has a great value in presenting a certain story. Then "Who" tells us the story as well as "how" it is presented are the core ideas in a certain story telling process.

As Hawthorn has put it in her "statement" of the Prime Minister told about the economy, has plausibility rather than we "read" about it in an "opposition news paper". This is because the Prime Minister is the proper source and the right angle for the statement to be told. This causes an attitude difference between the given two statements.

Any author has the right to choose or select the optimum or proper point of view to present his story. He can make a choice between the first-person, and the omniscient, the limited omniscient and the objective narrative methods, etc.

Nevertheless, "the method of telling a story in most constant use is the third-personal method" (Edgar, 1968: 19). Of course, this suggestion seems to be true when we observe many foreigners' and Ethiopian writers' works.

For example, according to this researcher's personal assessment, as well as his reading, most Amharic novels are written in third-person omniscient narrative method. For instance, the known Ethiopian authors' works such as: Bealu's Derasiw, Yekey Kokeb Tiri, Haddis's Fikir Eske-Mekaber, Wonjelegñāw Dagñña, Berhanu's Yeabiyot Mebacha, Wazema, and Magist are written from the third-person point of view. However, most author's tradition shows that telling a story in the first-person narrative method is the least frequent.

As a result, the researcher poses the question, "why" writers' tradition of using the first-person story telling method is not well accustomed and developed?

Therefore, he wanted to take this issue as a research problem and answer the question “why”. It was because of this that the researcher decided to analyze the first-person point of view in some Amharic novels.

To accomplish this objective, it was thus necessary to select novels which are presented in the first-person narrative technique. Indeed, as it is mentioned earlier they are few in number. Nevertheless, after a thorough examination, the following four novels which are easily available to the researcher, and are works of known Ethiopian writers, are selected to be the focus of this study. These are Negash G/Mariam’s (Inanu Agonafer’s) Settegāña Adari, Wondimu Negash’s Enbutte Tsigerida, Hailemeleket Mawale’s Yewedianesh and Bealu Girma’s Oromay.

1.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the first-person narrative method, and also to examine the advantages and disadvantages of this story telling technique. Along with this, to point out this method’s different features which distinguishes it from other vantage points; as well as to compare and differentiate strong and weak points of the authors whose works are undertaken in this study in using first-person narrative method.

1.2 Significance of the Study

The significance of this research or its contribution will be to students of literature. It may help them in the understanding of the narrative technique in general, and first-person narrative technique in particular. Moreover, the other significance of this study is to be a springboard, and to pave a way for other interested researchers to do more and intensive research in the same field.

1.3 Scope of the Study

As it has been indicated earlier the focus of this study is to analyze the first-person narrative technique in the above selected first-person Amharic novels. So, by taking each novel in turn, and again by comparing the techniques (narrative techniques) used in each of them, the general technique of the first-person point of view shall be discussed.

1.4 Review of Related Literature

To begin with Agageññhu Tesfa, in 1984 E.C. for his B.A. degree conducted a research on the narrative techniques of Bealu Girma's novel Oromay. The reason for his research was a comment which reads: "Oromay, is readable for its content rather than it's narrative technique". So, the researcher as he describes in his abstract, his aim was to prove or disprove the given comment, therefore, he has done his research. Then, finally Agageññhu in his research conclusion stated that, Oromay is a novel which can be readable for its content as well as its writing (narrative) technique" (Agageññhu, 1984: 78). Of course, Agageññhu in this research, apart from examining the literary quality and the narrative technique of Oromay, has also raised and analyzed the novel's vantage point, and thus he pointed out the shifting of point of view in the novel.

Here, what makes my research different from Agegññhu's study is that, my research purpose is to analyze the first-person narrative technique in the novel, and to compare it with the novels, which are taken for this study and written in the first-person point of view.

Mersha Alehegñña, in 1990 E.C., conducted research, on "Narrative time in Hailemelekot's Yewedianesh, and Gungun as well as in Yeshitela Kokebe's Dossegññaw and Wegegta". He compared the narrative time, of the two author's novels. In the conclusion of this B.A. thesis, Mersha set out the differences of the

authors in using “time” as a narrative technique. For instance, according to Mersha, one of the differences of the authors reflected was the using of a flash back technique, so, Hailemeleket used it to fill the gaps, which are created in the narrative process, but Yeshitela used the technique to describe and narrate the past history of the characters (Mersha, 1990: 50).

Mersha’s study focused on the two novelists narrating time aspect, otherwise, he did not raise a point about the vantage points of the novels; which is the main issue and the basic question of my study.

In 1980 E.C. Ibrahim Hassen, did research on: “Criticism on Yewedianesh, and Literary Criticism appeared in News papers about Yewedianesh”. Ibrahim, his B.A. thesis, evaluates and analyzes the novel, and the given criticisms on the novel.

Again in 1986 E.C., Tigabu Muche, and Negussie Solomon, with the topics “Narrative techniques in Dar Eskadar, Tiqur Dem and Teleflef” and “The narrative technique in the Thirteenth Sun”, conducted researches respectively.

Neguisse Negash in 1990 G.C. did research on “Point of View in Andarge Mesfin’s Tiqur Dem.” Another researcher Berihun Meberate in 1981 E.C. on the topic: “The narrative technique of Andleamest.” Again Fanta Ayalew in 1980 E.C., “Literary techniques of Amharic novels and themes since 1933-1950 E.C.”, and Ambaye Degefu “Narrative Technique and the Choice of Point of View in Haddis Alemayehu and Bealu Girma’s novels”, were conducted researches.

The other research work which could be mentioned here is, Anteneh Awoke’s 1993 G.C. M.A. thesis research. Anteneh, researched on: “The Roles of Narrators in Geez Narratives and Early Amharic Diadactic Prose Fiction.” So, Anteneh in

his research analyzed the functions and role of the narrators in Geez narratives, as well as the great influence of Geez narratives on the early Amharic diadactic prose fictions.

From local research works reviewed, the last but not the least is Taye Assefa's research work. In 1986 G.C., Taye conducted a study for his Ph.D thesis. The topic for his research was "Form in the Amharic Novel". Taye based his research on ten known Ethiopian authors works; among these works, are: Afawarq G/Yesus's Lebbwollad Tarik, Haruy's Haddis Alem, Germachew's Araya, Makonnen's Almothum Beyye Alwashem and Negashi's Settegñña Adari, etc. are to be mentioned here. In the conclusion of his study, Taye set out his findings about the forms of Amharic novels, besides, he forwarded some points about the writers of the novels.

Regarding the narration of Amharic novels (narrative) Taye pointed out that "many novels appearing after 1950 E.C. resort to characters that are social types rather than abstractions of ideas. Their plots operate on a higher scale of probability. Their dialogues are casual and have the semblance of naturalness. They use narrators that are less patronizing and reserved from openly conveying their value judgements. Events are presented chronologically, often in scenic form" (1986: 3).

Now, apart from the aforementioned local researches, on the narrative technique, and point of view, in fact, there are other foreigners who dealt on the topic. Therefore, among the many, here are some the reviewed works of foreigners, which this researcher read and come across and also based his study.

So, to start with X.J. Kennedy (1991), Kennedy in his Literature an Introduction to Fiction, Poetry and Drama, analyzed technique of point of view and the role of

different narrators in a certain story. Then, according to their role he divided them into two and presented them as: participant and non-participant narrators. If a story is written in first-person point of view, the narrator may be a participant of the story, and he/she could be a major or a minor character in the story. On the other hand, if a story is presented in third person point of view, the narrator could be a non participant and thus, a narrator may be an all-knowing who sees into the minds of all the characters in the story, or to one major, minor characters or he may be an objective narrator who does not see into the minds of any characters in the story.

As X.J. Kennedy, when Phelan (1996) writes about a narrative method in his book called: 'Narrative as Rhetoric Technique Audience, Ethics, Ideology he categorized the method as: Authodiegetic, Heterodiegetic and Homodiegetic narration. Therefore, according to Phelan's classification of the narrative method an Autodiegetic narration is the telling of a story by its protagonist character of a story. A Heterodiegetic narration is, a narration in which the narrator exists at a different level of (fictional) existence of the characters. Such a narrator is an omniscient third-person narrator. Again a Homodiegetic narration is, a narrative where the narrator exists at the same level of existence as the other characters.

Again Kirzner and Stephen (1991:174) in their book: Literature, Reading, Writing discussed about the choice of "point of view," and they said: "the first choice writers make is who tells the story. This choice determines the story's point view – the angle or vantage point from which events are presented". So, they (Kirzner and Stephen) gave priority for the selection of point of view and discussed it in their book widely.

William J. Grace (1965) in his book: Response to Literature raised about point of view, and indicated that in recent years ideas about the techniques of fiction has

undergone many refinements and new emphasis is being placed on the most effective point of view from which to narrate a story and on the wisdom of the narrator's showing rather than telling. So, the novelist should show rather than tell in his/her fictional story.

Another writer Roger Fowler (1973: 12) in Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms wrote about the significance of narrative technique and he said: "... the discussion of the nature of narrative and the mode of narration can carry us to the heart of the meaning of a work of fiction." So, for Fowler, the issue of narrative technique (point of view) is one of the main substance in a fiction work.

Genette Gerard (1980: 217) in a book called: Narrative Discourse, wrote about narrative technique and point of view which he called (Focalization). So, especially by focusing the issue of narrative time ^{he} she distinguished four types of narrating, such as: Subsequent, Prior, Simultaneous and Interploated. So, subsequent narration is: the classical position of the past tense narrative, undoubtedly far and away the most frequent. Prior narration is: predictive narrative, generally in the future tense, but not prohibited from being conjugated in the present. Simultaneous narration is: narrative in the present contemporaneous with action; and Interpolated narration is: between the moments of the action.

Holman Kenan (1980) in his: A Hand Book to Literature, discussed about different features of narrative. In his discussion of narrative he pointed out two types or forms of narration and said: "There are two forms of narration: simple narrative, which is content to recite an event or events and is largely chronological in its arrangement of details [Again], a narrative with plot which is less often chronological and more often arranged according to a preconceived

artistic principle determined by the nature of the plot and the type of the story intended” (1980: 308).

Again A.S. Burack (1964), in the Writers' Hand Book, raised about point of view and its method of selection so he stated the following idea: “The general or main point of view selected depends, of course, on the material and the way it is to be handled, it should be the one which will tell the story the best way for the greater part of the wordage” (1964: 232-233). Another writer, Bertil Romberg (1962) in the book known as: Studies In the Narrative Technique of the First-person Novel wrote in detail about the first-person point of view, or first-person novel; and thus he stated in his book about the meaning of the first person novel, the first-person narrator, and the place of the real author while the novel is presented in first-person narrator. So, according to Romberg by a first-person novel is meant:

a novel that is narrated all the way along in the first-person by a person who appears in the novel, the narrator, who is experiencing and observing things, and partly the person who is telling the story. In the first-person novel the real author withdraws from the scene, and instead brings forward the fictitious narrator; then the place of the author is behind this fictitious narrator (1962:4).

Mick Short (1995) in his book: Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose, discussed about point of view and suggested that in the 20th century the study of a novel has been the study of point of view. So, for the selection of point of view he stated that it is necessary to make a basic distinction between what is described, and from what perspective it is described. Thus, the basic distinction between what happens and how it is described is useful if we are to understand how view point in the novel works.

The Author of Recent Theories of Narrative (1986), Wallace Martin, in the mentioned book, wrote about point of view, and said: “... analysis of point of view becomes a means of understanding how form and content are fused in the

novel. And the techniques specific to the novel involve the author's relation to the narrator, the narrator's to the story, and the ways in which they provide access to the minds of characters-matters of 'point of view'" (1986: 16-17). Also Shlomith, Rimmon Kenan (1983: 74-76) in her book called: Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics, wrote about point of view, however, as Genette, she called it Focalization. So, when she writes, regarding Focalization she stated that: "story is presented in the text through the mediation of some 'prism', 'perspective', 'angle of vision', verbalized by the narrator though not necessarily his. According to Genette analyzation of point of view Focalization can be either external or internal to the story. An external focalizer may perceive an object either from outside or from within. An internal focalizer may perceive the object from within." Another writer Jermy Hawthorn (1985) in the book: Studying the Novel raised about narrative technique and wrote about the importance of narrator in presenting a certain story; as well as about the existence of different narrators; such as: personified, named, and with a full human identity; human but anonymous; and not fully comparable with any human perspective. Of course, according to Hawthorn these can be divided into two categories, an outer, unnamed narrator and a named 'inner' narrator (1985: 59-60).

The last but not the least, Rene Wellek and Austin Warren (1943) in their book: Theory of Literature discussed about narrative method and particularly indicated the central problem of the narrative method. Thus, the relation of the author to his work is taken as the central issue by Wellek and Warren. Along with it these writers raised about first-person point of view and stated in their book that this method has to be carefully weighed against other methods.

Now let us pass to the next chapter and examine what a "narrative" is, and those issues "narrator", and "point of view", which are concerned as far as a "narrative" issue, is raised.

CHAPTER TWO

NARRATIVE, NARRATOR AND POINT OF VIEW

Narrative, narrator, and point of view are terms which are linked and interwoven. For instance, when one raises an issue about a narrative, he may also raise about a narrator, as well as point of view. Therefore, based on this relation, different literary theoreticians and critics, in many ways have given different kinds of explanations and suggestions on these issues. However, the given suggestions and explanations have no major differences in their general concepts that they hold about the terms; therefore, it can be said that they are very related. One to the other; so, let us examine literary theoreticians' and critics' explanations of the terms.

2.1 Narrative

Narrative, is: "an account in prose and it may be an actual or fictional event; described in a sequence of events" (Holman, 1980: 284). In fact, according to Holman, narrative could be fact, or fiction, and which have a sequential manner, where the events are presented.

Again, according to Genette (1980) narrative refers to a statement which is presented in a form of "oral or written" discourse. Thus, "oral" or "written page" discourse is a combination of "events or series of events". Of course, currently some narrative theoreticians and literary critics state narrative as: "the succession of events, real or fictitious..." (Ibid: 25). Genette when elaborates this suggestion she says:

*... today among analyst and theoreticians of narrative content,
... narrative refers to the succession of events, real or fictitious
that are the subjects of this discourse, and to their several*

relations. Of linking, opposition, repetition, etc. the oldest [meaning] has narrative refer once more to an event: not, however, the event that is recounted, but the event that consists of some one recounting something: the act of narrating taken in itself (Genette, 1980: 25-26).

Then the meaning of narrative, according to the current narrative theoreticians, refers to the succession of events in a certain story. Furthermore, it is an internal relationship of events of a story which are described in “opposition”, or “linking”, or “repetition” form. Thus, the current theory of narrative indicates narrative as the whole structure, and combination of a certain story. This is so widely different from the oldest meaning given for narrative in the previous time. The oldest theory of narrative explains narrative as an “event” of a story, which can exist by itself, and which recount of the events, or else, simply the “act of narrating itself” (Ibid).

On the other hand, when Hawthorn suggests the meaning of narrative, she said that a narrative can have two distinct meanings, that is to say “a narrow” or “specific” meaning (Hawthorn, 1985: 4).

When a narrative is said to be “narrow” it means, it is based on the level of telling or recounting of events. When the “wider” meaning is considered, then the narrative includes “everything that comes within the purview of a particular telling or recounting” (Ibid).

Therefore, from this perspective the wider meaning of narrative includes “everything within a page of a novel”. Any recounting and event even though a description argument of something are taken as a narrative.

Regarding types of narrative, when Holman writes, he distinguished between “narrative with plot”, and “simple narrative”. According to him “simple

narrative”, is a narrative which its content to recite an event or events and is largely chronological in its arrangement of details; and a “narrative with plot”, which is less often chronological more often arranged according to a preconceived artistic principle determined by the nature of the plot and the type of the story intended (Holman, 1980: 308).

The other point which has to be raised and discussed here about a narrative is that, about the ingredients that make a narrative to be a narrative or in other words, about the main factor that enables to say a certain narrative text is a narrative. First of all regarding this idea Rimmon Kenan (1983: 15) has suggested this: “The presence or absence of a story is what distinguishes narrative from non-narrative texts”. So, according to Rimmon-Kenan, if a certain text is to be called a narrative it has to deal with a certain story, or events, which can be recounted as a story. Otherwise, that particular text is not considered to be as a narrative. But here one thing has to be clear, regarding what Rimmon stressed and pointed out, that is: “... non-story elements may be found in a non-narrative text”. For instance, “sometimes a novel may well include the description of a cathedral, and the description of a cathedral, say in a guide book, may include the story of its construction” (Rimmon: Ibid.).

However, in a narrative discourse whether it is written or spoken, there must be, and is a succession of events in which one event follows the other event, and no gap or breakdown will be created in the process of the narration.

In general, a narrative text is different from a non-narrative text in its “events” and “the verbal representation”.

Another point to be raised and discussed in relation to a narrative is the issue of “time”, of course, narrative is a “succession of events” in a given time. Events, or

actions that are presented in work of fiction, are arranged and ordered in a time sequence of that particular fiction (Ibid.: 44).

Therefore, the narrative question again is not the order of “events” or the “succession of events” only, but it is also the question of time. “The issue of the main character in a story is not to ‘solve his problem but it is also to solve his problem in a given time” (Bruck, 1956: 166). Hence, a narrative is a discourse which is arranged in time, and also presented through time, and a specified narrator.

2.2 Narrator

A narrator, is any one who recounts a narrative in “writing” or “orally”. In fact, one who tells a certain story is a teller of that fictional story. He/she is a mediator who stands between the story and the reader, as well as who: “controls what will be told and how it will be perceived” (Martin, 1986: 9).

By shaping a story to reach readers, narrators play a great role. They are the door way to the fictional world. Then, every story being assumed that, it has a narrator; nevertheless, narrators in different fictional stories, are different in their type; they are different, because of the narrative level they belong to. Chatman in his book: Style and Structure in Literature (1975: 213-257) described types of narrators as follows:

Narrators can be defined ... according to the narrative level they belong, their participation in stories, the degree of perceptibility of their roles, and their reliability. For instance, a narrator is said to be “extradiegetic” when he is above or superior to the story he narrates. A narrator may be “intradiegetic” when he is a diegetic character in the first narrative told by the “extradiegetic” narrator ... narrators can be explained as “Hetrodiegetic” and “homodiegetic” according to the degree of their participation in stories.

So the, narrators are distinguished one from the other, because of their “participation, the degree of their perceptibility and reliability in the stories”. For instance, if a narrator is superior to the story which he/she narrates, such a narrator is an “extradiegetic” narrator, in other words, he/she is an omniscient narrator, who recounts each and every phenomenon of a fictional story. Since such omniscient narrator non-participant of the story then it is “out side”, the story.

Since an omniscient narrator is “outside” the fictional world, then it is a “God like” narrator. Therefore, such a narrator knows the secret thoughts of the fictional characters and is also able to read their minds. Thus, the narrator knows the characters interests, feelings, motives, their past, present, and future life, and also other things about them, they are not beyond his knowledge. Hence, there is no barrier of time and place to the omniscient narrator, or for such a story teller; and that is why, this narrator is said to be “superior” to the story he tells.

As opposed to “extradiegetic” narrator, there is a narrator called a “Homodiegetic” narrator. Such a story teller is a narrator who is found at the same level of other characters and he/she is ‘a protagonist narrator. With the same level of “Homodiegetic” narrator; another narrator which can be mentioned here is that “Intradiegetic” narrator. The intradiegetic narrator is a narrator who participates in the story which he/she tells; such a narrator may be one of the characters found or portrayed in the story.

So, such different types of narrators, while they are narrating a certain story they have to be recognized by the narratee. Then, how does the narratee recognize them in the story? Of course, for this purpose authors use different techniques when they portray their stories’ narrators. For example, authors may characterize them as a human beings, personifying them with full personality and

history; or they may present them by simply giving them a name. Sometimes also authors make narrators anonymous. So, when Hawthorn (1985: 57-58) writes about the personification of narrators she stated the following idea:

... the author can have the story told through the mediation of personified narrator, a teller' recognized by the reader as a distinct person with defined individual human characteristics ... some narrators may even have names and detailed personal histories... Other narrators may just indicate to us that they are persons perhaps by the occasional use of "I" in their narrative but will tell us no more about themselves than this. We thus have a continuum of possibility: (i) personified, named and with a full human identity, (ii) human but anonymous (iii) not fully comparable with any human perspective.

Therefore, Hawthorn, described the many possibilities that can be the narrators to be recognized by the narratee in the story where they serve as a narrator. So, when they are portrayed as human beings with full human characteristics, and identity, they are fully known by the readers. But when they are characterized by simply giving them a name, it is difficult to know them fully and some times a complication may arise because of the name given to the narrator and the other character name being the same, thus, confusion may be created in distinguishing the narrator character, and the other characters.

Hence, if narrators are fully personified in a narrative, then, there is an assumption that such narrators have some "relationship", with the actions or events that take place, or are described in that particular story (Ibid: 70).

On the other hand, in fact, for intensifying personification, naming also has a great role to play. "The granting of a name conventionally intensifies the degree of personification, the extent to which we think of a narrative source as human and individual..." (Hawthorn, 1985: 61). Of course, since the life history of a narrator, his/her personal interests, motives, physical and psychological

appearances, and the like are to be described, then, these may help the readers of the story to take the story's source as human, and thus draws attention of the readers to the story. In addition, it creates a sense of strong intimacy between the events/actions of the story, and the readers.

In the case of a narrator which is not fully personified, such as: a narrator which is being denoted by "I" and tells nothing about himself, however, it is expected that the narrator is a human being; because of his general interaction seen and evaluated in relation to the other characters which are fully personified and reflects characteristics of human beings.

Another point to be raised here about narrators is that they are being considered as the "Voice" of a narrative. According to Chatman, as cited by Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 87). "Every [narrative] text has an implied author and implied reader, the implied author is voice less and silent, but the narrator is the narrative 'voice' or 'speaker' of a text". So, a narrator has a full responsibility in serving the "implied author" by voicing the authors fictional world. He speaks to the reader as a mouth piece of the writer. So, in communicating the fictional world with the real world reader of a story, narrators have a paramount importance in a narrative world.

While narrators serve as a medium and a mediator between the fictional world events, and the real world reader; sometimes they become unreliable in their position and function. Thus: "intentionally or unintentionally, they may mispresent events and misdirect readers" (Kirszner and Mandell, 1991: 180). Of course, they may trick a reader by: "with holding information or by telling untruths" (Short, 1995: 268). Therefore, in this regard, information to be told, and "truths" to be fed, to the reader of a story are deliberately concealed or ignored by the narrator. So, in this case the unreliability of narrators is reflected.

The unreliability of narrators, some times occurs not because the narrator wants to “trick” the reader deliberately, but because he/she is mentally disadvantaged (Ibid.), in fact, if the narrator he/she has a mental problem or is absent minded, he/she may forget to tell the information. Which he/she has to tell; as well as he/she may also falsify the “truth” and tell the wrong idea, or forward false information (message) to the reader.

Again some times narrators’ limitation of knowledge of the story make them ask questions in the fictional world. Thus such a phenomenon again might be a cause of their unreliability.

To conclude, a certain narrative to be narrated, of course, there is no question on the essentiality of a narrator. Thus, he/she presents the events and actions of the story; and he/she is responsible for the process of the whole narration, such as: “identifying, and describing setting, characters, summarizing, reporting and commenting etc.” (Holman, 1980: 10-11). However, narrators can be characterized, from different points of view, therefore, their view, knowledge, reliability etc. in presenting a certain story’s actions and events, or generally in mediating a certain story could differ from one to the other. Hence, a certain point of view has its own influence on the function of narrators. Therefore, now, we shall turn to the next section and examine the issue of point of view.

2.3 Point of View

“Point of view” means in ordinary language “stand point” “opinion”, or “out look”. These meanings are all contained in the critical term point of view, which refers to the stand point from which the author lets the reader see and follow the events of the novel. A good straight forward definition... is given as the position from which the story is presented (Romberg, 1962: 12).

Here then, according to Romberg (1962), "point of view" is a position from which the author narrates the story; or the angle the reader of a certain story can see and follow up the actions and events of the story. Point of view, is in fact, a position where the events of a story seem to be observed and presented to the readers. Literary critics, at different times, have suggested ideas on the issue of "point of view", therefore, according to these critics, point of view is: "the relation in which the author stands to his story", or "the position from which the story is presented", again "the mind through which the material of the story is presented", or the "focus of the narrative" (Ibid.: 12). However, the views of the critics on point of view differ in wording; regarding their meanings, there are no major differences to be indicated. Of course, the matter of "vantage point" is a serious issue of a novel in literary history.

"Indeed, the critical study of the novel in the 20th century has to a very large extent been the study of point of view" (Short, 1995: 260). So, the matter of point of view has been a great issue of the time (20th century); it has been analyzed, and critically examined in the century's novels. Therefore, since point of view is a means and a method of presenting a fictional story, it is necessary to study it, critically, and thoroughly. As it is described by literary critics, point of view, is a means of perspective where readers view (see) the fictional world: "a world which the reader is presented with the characters, actions, setting, and events, which constitute the narrative in a work of fiction. The question of point of view has always been a practical concern of the novelist..." (Abrams, 1981: 142-143). Therefore, the novelist critically thinks about the selection of point of view, because, all works of fiction are told or presented by someone, then the first thing the novelist has to do is to choose the vantage point. "This choice determines the angle from which events are presented" (Kirszner and Mandell, 1991: 175).

Then, in every day life: “who tells a story” and “how” is it told”, make a very big difference and have its own impact on the story presented. The angles where a certain fiction is told also has an effect on the reader’s attitudes and interests; for example, when Hawthorn (1985: 57) discussed this issue (the issue of point of view) in the book “Studying the Novel”, she raised the example of “film making”, and the “film director, and the camera,” to indicate the relation between the author and point of view he chooses for his writing. So Hawthorn says:

... writing of a novel is comparable to the making of a film. When we watch a film we seem to be seeing ‘things as they are’, reality. But a director has chosen how we see these things, this reality, he or she has decided whether a camera will be placed high or low, whether there will be rapid cuts from one camera angle to another or not, whether a camera will follow one character as he walks a street-and so on... each of these ways would produce a different effect upon the audience... the audience’s attitude toward each character can be affected by different camera angles, cutting, and so on.

It is true that, different “Vantage points”, create or have different effects on the reader’s attitudes. A story presented in an omniscient point of view has a different impact on the reader’s attitudes towards the story, rather than a story told in first-person point of view. And also the vice-versa is true. Therefore, the angle where the story can be told is a crucial issue to the novelist; because, it is the author’s stand point, also it is:

... his starting-point, his point of observation from which he surveys the fictitious events, the world that he hopes to make real and vivid for the reader. From this stand point of the author, there then opens out a field of vision, a view of these events. And it will be from this point of view that the reader for his part can look in on the world of the fiction (Romberg, 1962: 22).

Therefore, when an author selects a point of view, he has to be careful in his selection, since point of view is many things to him; a great consideration is expected in dealing with it. So when the author wants to select an appropriate

point of view he has to deal first on the material which he intends to write, that is, he has to consider the material and analyze the best way (point of view), to present the material to the reader. Of course, selecting a point of view is a method carefully to be weighed.

Now, to conclude the issue of “point of view”, let us take a look at the following comment which is given by Genette on point of view. Genette says: “point of view... a narrative perspective... mode of regulating information... is the one that has been most frequently studied since the end of the nineteenth century...” (Genette, 1980: 185).

However, point of view has been studied for a long time and being one of the essential parts to be considered in the study of narrative technique in the past, it was not without dispute in naming it. Since the time of Percy Lubbocks (Genette: 1980: 168) who analyzed point of view, there were differences, in naming “point of view”. For instance, Genette (1980: 188) called it “focalization”, Cleanth Brook and Roben Penn Warm see it as a “focus of narration”, (Romberg, 1962: 12) Pouillon and Tzvetan Todorov called it “vision”, or “aspect”, (Genette: 188) and Mick Short (1995: 266) named it “perspective”. Nonetheless, “point of view” is a part and parcel of narration; of course, to create attitudes in the minds of readers towards a story, and being effective and suitable to narrate a story, one type of point of view differs from the other type; therefore, choosing the best one is the right, and interest of each novelist. Hence, now we shall deal with such different types of point of views.

2.3.1 Omniscient Point of View

Omniscient point of view is “a traditional technique of novel writing, in which the author himself takes the floor among all his created, fictitious characters, comments upon them and talks to the reader about them” (Romberg, 1962: 5).

So, the omniscient point of view is well known and accustomed by writers for a long time. However, when a fictional work is presented in an omniscient point of view, there is an assumption that the narrator of the story is the real author of the fiction. No character is responsible for the narrating process except, the real author in a disguised form. Therefore, according to this assumption, all the deeds of fictional characters which take place in the story are presented through the author's mouth. The author by being disguised stands behind, the implied narrator, and tells the story to the readers of fiction. Thus, he describes all the happenings, and gives comments on the actions and situations of characters.

However, the idea which says that "omniscient point of view", is the "view" of the real author in a disguised way (form), has no acceptance by some literary critics, and so they say: "Omniscient" point of view is not the real author's view, because 'omniscient' means 'all knowing', and human beings are not generally all knowing" (Hawthorn, 1985: 59). Hence, the term "omniscient" is: "often used in a loose way to indicate any work in which the narrative has access to that which-like a character's secret thoughts is normally concealed to observers in the real world" (Ibid.).

Of course, narrating a story in "omniscient" point of view, helps to reach the minds of the characters, as well as their inner feelings, and thoughts etc.... Thus, the access to the minds, and inner motives of the characters through "omniscient" point of view is simple, thus to enable and to reveal the thoughts of individuals character, and again able to present; "a body of information to the reader; that no single character could possibly know" (Kiszner and Mandell, 1991: 178).

In omniscient point of view the narrator knows everything that: "needs to be known about the agents and events, he is free to move as he will in time and

place and to shift from character to character, reporting what he chooses of their speech and actions” (Abrams, 1981: 143).

In this case, in omniscient point of view the narrator has no limitation in time and place. He can exist in every place and time, he moves back and forth, in the fictional world; by shifting from the mind of one character, to the other, he can easily narrate the story. Hence, omniscient point of view: “allows the reader to obtain the deepest possible insight into the fictitious action...” (Romberg, 1962: 24). However, this point of view is not without drawbacks, while a story presented in this vantage point, there is a distance between the characters and the reader, it is impossible to create intimacy between them. Another drawback of this point of view is that, it misleads the reader that the omniscient narrator being identified with the real author.

2.3.2 Limited Omniscient Point of View

Limited omniscient point of view is categorized in the third-person point of view. Some literary critics called this vantage point: “selective omniscience”, “focus” or “mirror”, or “center of consciousness”(Kennedy, 1991: 20).

So, whenever writers use this point of view, the narrator focuses only on one major or minor character’s experiences. Therefore, instead of a composite of seeing different angles he (the narrator) is fixed on one character’s movements. Hence, the reader is limited to the mind of only one of the characters, [and his experience] (Romberg, 1962: 26). Thus nothing is revealed that: “the character does not see, hear, feel or think (Kiszner and Mandell, 1991: 179). This means that the narrator follows that particular character’s movements, he reads his mind, and hears his heart beat, he describes what that character sees, also the characters likes, and dislikes etc. will be revealed. Anyway, by and large, the whole situation of the narrative is encompassed with the general movement of a

selected major or minor character. Nothing will be told, outside his/her movements and deeds. Of course, the events and actions of other characters are being described in relation to the actions and practices of the selected figure (character) of the story.

Limited omniscient point of view therefore, though it is one of the narrative methods later writers developed it into “stream of consciousness narration”. Since it is limited: “... to the consciousness of a character within the story itself, it aims at giving the reader the illusion that he/she participates in experiencing events that simply evolve before his/her eyes” (Abrams, 1981: 144). What the character experiences and goes through and tastes etc. are to be the readers experience; nothing less, nothing more. So, this method has such advantage.

Again the other advantage of this vantage point is that, its narrators are found to be reliable: “they give readers an accurate version of what happened...” (Kiszner and Mandell, 1991: 179). Since they narrate by focusing on one of the characters experiences and deeds they would have no chance to tell untruths. However, this method along with its advantage has its drawbacks such as: “to be restricted to one character, the narrator of this point of view is limited to a single character as his central consciousness and manifests his own judgements on people and events, and also controls the judgements of the reader” (Abrams, 1981: 144). Of course, these are the main drawbacks of the limited omniscient point of view. It does not give a chance to the reader to create an attachment with other characters and allow them to know their opinion, view, interests etc. freely. And so, it hampers them to give their judgements on the actions and practices of other characters.

2.3.3 Objective Point of View

Objective (dramatic) point of view is classified in the third-person narration method. Through this method of narration a narrator tells the story, by remaining entirely outside the character's mind, and records all the events and action as a photo camera. When Kiszner and Mandell (1991: 170) write about this narration method, and the function of the narrator they said:

... within objective point of view narrators events unfold the way they would in a play or a movie. Narrators tell the story only by reproducing dialogue and by providing descriptions of the action. They do not present the thoughts of characters or offer insight into their action or motivations.

In the objective method, events, and actions in the story are presented to the reader as they are and perceived; however, the method hampers the narrator to give his comments or suggestions on the movements of characters and their actions and deeds. In addition, the narrator is not expected to present to the readers, things and thoughts that goes on in the minds of the characters; in other words, such a narrator is unable to read the minds of the characters, because since the method is "objective" it does not allow the narrator to do so.

In fact,⁴⁴ the narration based on the objective situation of the characters and their actions, can be perceived with plain eyes; but the issues which are beyond the actual actions, and practices of the fictional characters are not the issues in objective point of view.⁴⁵ (Ibid.)

In "objective" narrating technique, the author through his narrator presents all the actions of the actors (characters) of the story to the readers' vision. Readers can easily see the characters while they interact with one another, for instance, while characters talk, sit, stand, love, and quarrel with each other, these actions come openly to the vision of the readers. The narrator dramatizes whole events and actions in the story.

In general, in the objective narrative techniques a narrator “for the most part describes, reports, or shows the action in dramatic scene, without introducing his own comments of judgements” (Abrams, 1981: 143-144). Thus, the narrator in the method is an observer of the characters’ actions, a reporter of events, but not a commentator of things which happens in the story. This method according to Friedman, as cited by Romberg (1962: 26) is:

.... Characterized by the author’s choosing to dispose of mental states altogether what the reader learns about the fictitious figures is what they say and do, not what they think, or how they feel; the reader apparently listens to no-one but the characters themselves, who move as it were upon a stage; this angle of view is that of the fixed front.

So, the narrator in the objective method reports the dialogue and the actions of the characters; therefore, he is passive to the story, so, to evaluate and analyze the phenomenon in the narrative is the readers’ part. However, to this end, the objective point of view, is a technique which is suitable to narrate a story in a “showing” method, rather than a “telling” one.

2.3.4 First-Person Point of View

First-person point of view the most usual and the oldest type of point of view is where the main character mostly narrates his own life history, or autobiography. This autobiography type is the first type of first-person vantage point. The other type is where a narrator is not the main character: “... instead a character who stands at some distance away from the center of the action and interest. He is often a friend or an admirer of the main character” (Romberg, 1962: 62). Hence, the second type is known as a witness narrator.

Such, a narrator may be a minor one “who plays a small part” in the narration or an observer, who reports events which is experienced by others. Sometimes in this vantage point the narrator narrates by saying “we”. Therefore, such kind of novel or narrative is classified as a first-person novel or narrative.

First-person point of view is also used in the memoir diary, and epistolary novels.

In this narration method then, the narrators could be seen:

... as the protagonist, as some other major character, as some minor character as a mere spectator, or even as a character who arrives late upon the scene and tries to piece together what happened (Kennedy, 1991: 19).

Of course, in first-person narrative, the narrator could be the main or minor character (as a witness, a friend, or an admirer of the main character, or a character who appeared “late” in the story). The late comer narrator is a narrator who would receive information from the previous narrator and then resume narrating by piecing the information he got.

In general, first-person point of view: “is a method carefully to be weighed against others. Such a narrator must not, of course, be confounded with the author” (Wellek and Warren, 1949: 222). So, when the narrator refers to him, or her in the fictional story, the first-person pronoun “I” is used, so, the vantage point is the first-person point of view.

In the immediate chapter we have discussed about narrative, narrator and point of view, as well as their interwoven relation. Of course, they are linked and interwoven; thus, when we raise to talk about a narrative, we may also shall raise about the narrator and point of view. However, they are related each other, it does not mean they are the same. Therefore, when they are examined separately, in fact, each of them has their own meaning; hence, narrative is a combination of events or series of events which can be presented orally or in written form. On the other hand, the narrator is any one who recounts a narrative in “writing” or “orally”, however, narrators are distinguishable, and according to their participation in a certain story they recount.

Again regarding point of view, it has been stated that, it is a position from which an author presents his story; or the angle point where the reader of a certain story can observe, or followup the actions and events of the story. Point of view also can be categorized as: omniscient, limited omniscient, objective, and first-person ... etc. point of view.

We have discussed in detail all the mentioned point of views, in the immediate chapter; now, we shall pass to the next chapter which brings us the synopsis of the novels; which this study has undertaken; and then examine the first-person narrators of the novels.

CHAPTER THREE

THE NOVELS /SYNOPSIS/

As has already been mentioned in the previous chapters, the focus of this research is to analyze the first-person narrative technique in four Amharic novels. So, for a better understanding of the forthcoming analysis, it is essential to present in turn the synopsis of the four novels: Settegnāna Adari, Enbutte Tsigerida, Yewedianesh, and Oromay.

3.1 Settegnāna Adari

Settegnāna Adari, a novel written by Negash. G/Mariam (Molaver, 1997: 373) with a pseudonym “Inanu Agonafer”, was published in the year 1956 E.C. Inanu is portrayed in the novel as an author as well as a narrator and the main character of the novel.

The story in the novel evolves around the life history (biography) of Inanu. She narrates her autobiography; and when she starts narrating the story, she begins by describing her early rural life and marriage she had experienced fifteen years before she came to Addis Ababa. She states it as follows:

የትውልድ አገሬ ጎጃም ያደግሁት ደሴ ሲሆን ለልጃገረድ ባሌ የተዳርኩት ገና በ12 ዓመቱ ነው። ስልጃገረድ ባሌ ጋር ሦስት ዓመት ተቀምጫለሁ። ልጅ አልወለድንም። ለልጃገረድ ባሌ የሰጡኝ ወላጆቼ ሲሆኑ ለሁለተኛው ባል የዳረኝ ስደቤ ወደ አዲስ አበባ ቀስ እያለ ይጎተት የነበረ አንድ የኢጣሊያን መኪና ነው።
(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 8)

My birth place is Gojjam though I was brought up in Dessie. It was only when I was twelve years old that I married my first husband and lived with him for three years. However, we had no child. My parents were the ones who made me marry him, and my second marriage resulted from the journey I had made by an old slow moving Italian car from Dessie to Addis Ababa.

(Settegnāna Adari, 1956: 8)

Inanu met her second man (husband) on the journey from Dessie to Addis. At the end of journey, he took her home and made her his wife. Of course, she was a new comer to the city. As a result, she knew no one except this man. Nevertheless, the man was a habitual drinker who had an odd personality; so Inanu, because of the man's bad character, was unable to lead a peaceful life. He insulted and beat her; degraded her every time. This made her life very hard. However, since she had no one she knew in the capital, she was compelled to live with him. She had no choice other than to live with a broken heart and suffer.

While Inanu was leading such a bad life with her second husband, one day the whole picture of her life with this man suddenly changed. When he came fully drunk to his house where she had lived two and half years, he seriously quarrelled with her (Inanu). And then she went out from his house and went to search a shelter. Fortunately she met her aunt, in an area called Addis Ketema. Then thanks for her aunt and her good fortune, Inanu got a job as a waitress in Markato "Tej bet", with a monthly salary of ten birr in addition to the privilege of getting food and lodging.

While Inanu was working in the "Tej bet" she indulged in prostitution. She began to make love and to create sexual relationships with different men. As a result of her indulgement, and unbounded sexual relationship, she contracted a venereal disease called "syphilis". Thus, this disease became a good cause for some jealous women in Tej bet to blackmail her and to take her lovers; saying that she had contracted an incurable diseases. Of course, they blackmailed her, and made her lose all her lovers; then she left the "Tej bet" to join another job in "Wube Berha". Inanu summerizes how she left the "Tej bet" as follows:

ወዳጆቼን ለመውሰድ ይመኙ ከነበሩት ቤቶች ውስጥ የእኔ ሕመም አደገኛና የግይደወስ መሆኔን አውርተው እያስወሩ ከብዙ ወዳጆች አለያዩኝ። "መርፌ ቂጢኝን ይቀብራል እንጂ መቼ ያጠፋዋል!" እያሉ መጠቃቀሻ ስላደረጉኝ መርካቶን ለቅቄ እንድወጣ ግደታ ሆነብኝ... ወደ ውቤ በረሀ ተሰደድኩ።

በአሻሻጭነት ተቀጥሮ ከብዙ ሴቶች ጋር በመሰለፍ ሌላ ዓይነት ሕይወት ጀመርኩ።

(ሴተኛ አዳሪ: 1956: 22-23)

Those women who were wishing to take my lovers talked and also made others talk about me that I had contracted a dangerous and incurable diseases. It was as a result of this, that many of my lovers left me. In addition to this, those women who felt that “modern medical treatment was no cure to syphilis” degraded me as they always talked to each other by pointing their fingers at me and made me a subject of their discussion; then I decided to leave Merkato and move to Woube Berha to start a new life of being a waiter in Night Club with a lot of women

(Settegñña Adari, 1956: 22-23)

When Inanu joined Wubē Berha, prostitution became her profession; she also became a known lady in this business. In a short time, she learned how to behave in the circumstance of Wubē Berha. She asserts this and says: “... በውቤ በረሀ ለመኖር የሚያስፈልገውን ዘዴ ስምንቱን የሥራ ጓደኞቼን እየተመለከትሁ ቶሎ መግር ቻልኩ”(ሴተኛ አዳሪ: 1956: 25) “By observing the activities of my workmates I learned the methods of running the business in Wubē Berha in a short time” (Settegñña Adari, 1956: 25).

While Inanu ran prostitution as a business, in Wubē Berha Night Club, she made different contacts with many men who were customers of the Night Club. This made her fall in love with one young man, who was 30 years old. She made love only with this young man. And through time, she developed contact and conceived, and then gave birth to a child. So, she was not able to continue her business in the Wubē Berha Night Club. Hence, she was obliged to leave her job. The following is what she states about her living condition and the motive for leaving Wubē Berha’s Night Clubs:

ዮናስን ታቅፌ ወደ ውቤ በረሀ መመለስ ብዙ ችግር የሚያስከትልብኝ ሆኖ ታየኝ ሕፃን ልጅ ታቅፌ አሻሻጭ ለመሆን በጣም የሚያዳግት መሆኑ ታወቀኝ [ስለዚህ] አንድ ቤት ተከራይቼ ለመኖር ቆረጥኩ። የልጄን አባት አስቸግሮ በወር

40 ብር እየከፈልኩ ሁለት ክፍል ያለው ቤት በገዳም ሰፈር...
መንገድ ዳር ተከራየሁ።

(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 65)

I felt that a lot of problems would be created if I returned to Wubē Berha with my child Jonah. I knew that it would be too difficult for a waitress to be a baby mother and nurse her child. [Therefore] I decided to rent a house and to have my own life, after asking Jonah's father to give me 40 Birr for a house rent every month. Accordingly, I rented the house in Gedam Sefer and began to live [a new life].

(*Settegnēna Adari*, 1956: 65)

Inanu began a new life in Gedam Sefer, after her stay in Woube Berha for seven years. Selling alcoholic drinks along with caring for her child Jonah. Nevertheless, Inanu was not lucky in such a business. Jonah's father who was helping her was killed in a car accident. So, she lost the man who was beside her and supporter of her living. This caused her a great sorrow and worry; thus she lost hope and was frustrated in life (living). She says:

በጣም ይረዳኝ የነበረው የልጅ አባት ከሞተበት ቀን ጀምሮ፣
የማሰብ ኃይል እየተቀነሰ፣ ፍርሀት፣ ሆደ ገሻገትና ራስን የመጣል
ባህሪ በቀላሉ ማረኩኝ።

(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 82)

Since the date of the death of my lover, helper and father of my son, my thinking power deteriorated and the sense of fear, frustration, and carelessness captured me.

(*Settegnēna Adari*, 1956: 82)

While Inanu was in such a frustrating situation, she conceived a child to a man whom she did not even remember his name, physical feature and address. Therefore, she was unwilling to give birth to a child, so she decided to abort the offspring by taking traditional medicine; however, the traditional medicine, which she took for the abortion, caused her to have a serious illness, which needed a medical care in a hospital. And then medical treatment was given to her by the hospital she was saved from sudden death.

In a few days, she recovered from her illness. But unfortunately after she had left the hospital, death snatched her child, Jonah away. She was left alone; and her life in Gedam Sefer deteriorated. She was in a hopeless situation. However, when she concluded writing her autobiography, she declared that she would never lose hope. She was an optimist about tomorrow, and states the following as a concluding remark:

ትገንት ስገላፊ ነገር መፀፀት ዋጋ የለውም ነገ ከዛሬ የተለየ
 ቀን ስለሆነ አስቀድሜ አልፈራውም። ምንም እንኳን አልፎ
 አልፎ ተስፋ ብቆርጥ ለመኖር ያለኝን ብርቱ የሆነ ፈቃድ፣
 ኃዘንና ሥቃይ ድል ሊያደርጉት አልቻሉም።
 (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 196፣ 131)

There is no point in being filled with remorse for things that passed away yesterday. Tomorrow will be different from today. So, I was not afraid of it; I was not apprehensive of the future. Even though sometimes I became despaired, worries and sufferings were never victorious over my strong ambition to live.
 (Settegnāna Adari, 1956: 131)

The optimistic woman Inanu, persisted not to be hopeless in life, as well as in having a strong ambition to live. She continued going through the hardships of the prostitution business. However, she still had a great hope in the coming days; she became very optimistic that at the end of her writing she boldly declared it.

3.2 Enbutte Tsigerida

Enbutte Tsigerida is a novel which is authored by Wondimu Negash (1982 E.C.). It is three hundred and nineteen pages long. It is narrated in the first-person by the main character of the story which depicts the life history of the narrator herself known as Mestawat. Mestawat is a pretty girl, who was born in Addis Ababa, in the vicinity of “Genefele”. She was the only daughter of Teshale and Gelaye.

Mestawat’s father Teshale was an educated person, who was very sensitive to his daughter’s education. Since the early days of Mestawat’s schooling he was beside

her. It was because of his support that she became a brilliant student. Mestawat tells us about her school days and Teshale's support to her in this way:

የተማሪ ሰው ልጅ መሆን ከፊደል ጋር መወለድ ነው! አስከሱ ድረስ የግንፍሌ ነዋሪዎች በአምስት አመቱ አማርኛ ማንበብና መጻፍ፣ ኤቢሲዲ ቆጥሬ ሃያ ስድስቱንም ፊደላት ሳላዛንፍ በቅደም ተከተላቸው መጻፍ ችልኩኝ። ደረጃ በደረጃ ስምንተኛ ክፍል ደረስኩ ተሻለም ሌት ተቀን ያስጠናኝ ጀመር...

(እንቡጥ ጽጌራዳ፣ 1982፣ 119)

The dwellers of Genfale were so surprised that they said: "the son of an educated man is born educated". This was because I was fully able to read and write Amharic letters at the age of five. Also I could write down the twenty-six English alphabets without making any mistakes in their order (sequence). Then, step by step I became a grade eight student as Teshale was also helping me in my study...

(*Enbutte Tsigerida*, 1982: 119)

So, when Mestawat was an eighth grade student and was devotedly following her education, her father Teshale was given promotion in his job. He was assigned to go to Harar to work as a senior inspector of the province's Schools Education Office. Therefore, he had to go to his job place; however, before he left Addis, Teshale wanted someone to be in charge of his family; so he decided to give this responsibility to his intimate friend Gedlu, and so told him the whole story. Gedlu accepted the request and then on the day Teshale, his wife and daughter Mestawat, including Gedlu met, together, Teshale declared to his family that Gedlu would be in charge and protector of his family. The narrator of this story Mestawat told us how her father Teshale gave the responsibility to Gedlu. The following is her narration:

... እሁድ የልብ ወዳጁንና ጓደኛውን ጋሼ ገድሉን አምጥቶ ... አስተዋወቀን [ተሻለ] አጅን ይዞ 'ገድሉ! ... ወንድሜም ጓደኛዬም አንተው ብቻ ነህና፣ በተለይ የመስተወትን ነገር አደራ! የልጄንና የገላዩን ነገር ላንተ ጥያለሁ [አለው]።

(እንቡጥ ጽጌራዳ፣ 1982፣ 120)

... on one Sunday, my father Teshale called his intimate friend Gedlu to our home, and introduced me and my mother to him. At that time my father Teshale, holding my hand, said to Gedlu as:

“Gedlu... You are as my brother, as well as my only friend; I entrust the responsibility of protecting my wife and my daughter Mestawat to you.”

(*Enbutte Tsegerida*, 1982: 120)

Since Teshale left Addis Ababa, Gedlu took the responsibility of protecting Teshale’s family and so he kept in touch with them. Mestawat continued her high school education and completed it with a successful result. In the mean time, Gedlu made contact with his friend who was a TV Enterprize head and arranged a fertile ground for Mestawat to have a job in the enterprise. So, after Mestawat completed high school education, she became an employee of the TV enterprise as a TV journalist. While Mestawat was working as a journalist, some people and authorities who watched her TV program were writing letters and calling her on the telephone to meet her. In fact, the reason for most people to write to her and call her was, her physical beauty rather than the TV program which she produced. So, in describing this phenomenon, she says:

ባለሥልጣናት፣ የመሳፍንትና የመኳንንት ልጆች፣ የናጠጡ ሀብታሞች፣ የመሬት ከበርቴዎች፣ በስልክና በደብዳቤ አዋክቦች፣ የመንፈስ እረፍት ነሱን። ስለቀንጅናዬ የሚናገሯቸው ቃላትማ የሚያሸማቅቁኝ፣ ግራ የሚያጋቡኝ ሆኑ።

(*እንቡጥ ፅጌሬዳ*፣ 1982፣ 199)

Some authorities, noble men, lords, and their sons who watched the TV program and looked at me on the TV screen, disturbed me and gave me no mental rest by writing letters and calling me on the telephone. Moreover, those words which they uttered about my beauty ... caused me shame and shock, both of which put me in a dilemma.

(*Enbutte Tsigerida*, 1982: 199)

The situation Mestawat faced on the TV Enterprize and other things which happened to her made her leave her job. For instance, her boss Ato Yared ordered her to produce a lot more TV programs and requested her to make love with him. As a result, she left this enterprise and joined a new private company called “FAMICO”.

In FAMICO (Importer of Agricultural Equipment Corporation), Mestawat was assigned to be a dupty manager of the advertising section of the company. Nevertheless, Gedlu, who made ground for Mestawat to have a job in the TV enterprise was not willing to accept Mestawat's new job; he was rather against it and he suspected her of having some kind of relationship (sexual relationship) with the FAMICO manager. This is what he said to her:

... በፋሚኮ ዋስ የሆነሽ ሥራ አስኪያጁ ራሱ ነው ... እንደ አባባልሽ ... ስለእዚህ ነዋ ገና ሰድስት ወር ሳይሞላሽ ስኮላርሽፕ ማግኘትሽ በከተማው የተወራው።
(እንቡጥ ፅጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 272)

According to your own statement... the FAMICO manager himself became your sponsor in the company. That was why you won the company's scholarship which was publicized in the city even before you stayed for six months on the new job.
(Enbutte Tsigereda, 1982: 272)

Here, Gedlu was not seen to be positive to Mestawat. He envied her new job and boss. He had a long time wish to have Mestawat as his girl friend and lover; however, such an idea was clear to Mestawat. In fact, the idea was in Gedlu's mind and thus one day he could not control himself and so described his long time wish to her, saying as:

... ካንቺ ጋር የተዋወቅሁበትን ዕለት እስከ ዛሬዋ ቀን ድረስ ሳልረሳት ኖራያለሁ። አንቺ ግን ምንም ሊገባሽ አልቻለም። አባትሽም ሆነ እናትሽ ምንም ሊረዱኝ አልቻሉም ... እንቺ አውቀሽ እያለመጥሽ አባትሽና እናትሽ እንደት ሊሆን ይችላል በማለት አሾፋችሁብኝ።
(እንቡጥ ፅጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 274-275)

Until this day I did not forget the first day I met with you; ... however, you did not understand me. Even your father and mother did not understand me. ... You knew my feelings I had towards you, but you pretended as if you did not know. Both of your father and mother and you yourself mocked at me.
(Enbutte Tsigerida, 1982: 274-275)

Of course, Gedlu was controlling his intimate friend's family; nevertheless, by ignoring and breaching his promise which he promised to Teshale, he wanted to

have an affair with Teshal's daughter, Mestawat. However, Mestawat did not have any expectation of Gedlu's intentions. She rather thought and considered Gedlu just like her beloved father, Teshale. But Gedlu wanted Mestawat to fulfil his intentions and so did not want to miss this pretty girl. He thought of raping her and succeeded in doing so in her own residence. Mestawat narrates as follows how this phenomenon occurred to her:

ገድሉ እጅን ጠምዝሁ አልጋው ላይ አስቀመጠኝ ... የአባቱ
 ባለአደራ ... በወንድነቱ ተመክቶ በእንሰሳዊ ድርጊቱ ደግሞን
 በአደግሁበት አልጋ ላይ አፈሰሰው ...
 (እንቡጥ ፅጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 276-277)

*By holding and twisting my hand, Gedlu made me sit on the bed...
 Being led by his chauvinistic and animalistic behavior, the man
 who promised to my father to protect my family and me, poured
 my blood on the bed I was brought up...
 (Enbutte Tsigerida, 1982: 276-277)*

After Gedlu raped Mestawat he abducted and took her to Nazret town. There he kept her for three days, and then brought her back to Addis Ababa. In Addis, Gedlu locked Mestawat in his house. However, one day when Gedlu instructed his guard not to let Mestawat out of his house, and went away, she thought of escaping from the confinement. She discovered Gedlu's piston and pointed at his guard and disappeared. She soon went to her family. However, on the way to her family, she was confronted with a great danger. The situation she was in and the danger she faced is narrated by herself as follows:

... በሸዋ ዳቦ መጋገሪያ ወደ ግንፍሌ እገሰግሥ ጀመር። ድልድዩን ሻገር
 ብዬ ወደ ግራ እጥፍ እንዳልኩ እንግሊዝ ቤ/ክርስቲያን አካባቢ ቆሞ
 የነበረ መኪና ... ወደ እኔ አቅጣጫ መጣ ... ከእኛ ቤት በኩል ከወደ
 ዳገቱ ሌላ መኪና መብራቱን በኃይል አብርቶ ቁልቁል ወደ እኔ
 ገሠገሠ። ከእንግሊዝ ቤ/ክርስቲያን በኩል የመጣው ከድልድዩ ጋር
 በጨረፍታ ተጋጭቶ ሽቅብ ወደሳንፎርድ ት/ቤት ወጣ ... ቁልቅል
 የወረደው መኪና ወደ እኔ ዘንድ ሲቀርብ ... ወደ ወንዙ ሮጥኩኝ
 ሁለት ወንዶች ... ከኋላዬ ሲንደረደሩ ዘወር ብዬ ተመለከትኩኛል ...
 ሽጉጤን እውጥቼ ከመደገኔ አንዱ ተወርወሮ ... እጆቼን ከወገቤ ጋር
 አጣብቆ ሲይዘኝ በእጅ የነበረው ሽጉጥ መጮሁና እኔም ሽጉጤ አካባቢ
 ተመትቼ መውደቄ ... ይታወሰኛል።
 (እንቡጥ ፅጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 317-318)

I was rushing along Shoa Bakery road to Genfele. When I passed the Genfele bridge and turned left, I saw a car beside the English Church moving towards me. Again another car, coming from the direction of our house in the upper side, began to run down towards me. The car approaching from the English Church slightly bumped against Genfele bridge and then passed to Sanford School. When I was sure that the car coming from the upper side came very close to me, I ran towards Genfele river. I soon turned back and saw two men following me. In self-defence, I took out my pistol and pointed at them. Suddenly however, one of them took hold of my hands against my waist. Soon I heard the shot of my pistol and realized that I had wounded my waist and fallen down.

(Enbutte Tsigerida, 1982: 317-318)

After that Mestawat was taken to hospital for medical help; and after a week, she left for West Germany for better medical treatment. Then Mestawat sponsored by her organization FAMICO, and stayed a few days in Germany and then returned home.

However, Mestawat was not completely cured and recovered. Her body, below her waist was paralyzed and she was unable to stand or move on her feet. Hence, she had to use a wheel-chair. However, through time her health improved and she began to walk on her feet. After her complete recovery, she married. Dr. Terefe who was her friend when she was working in the TV Enterprise. Mestawat wrote her story when she was paralyzed and stayed in bed.

3.3 Yewedianesh

Yewedianesh is a novel written by Hailemeleket Mawale (1978 E/C). This novel is named after the main character, Yewedianesh, whose life history is presented in twenty seven chapters and in three hundred and fifty three pages. Yewedianesh was brought up by her aunt, who was cruel and unkind to her. When Yewedianesh reached the age of fourteen, she left her aunt and the place where she was living (Dessie), and went to Addis Ababa.

After Yewedianesh came to Addis Ababa, she stayed for a month with a family, which came from Dessie with her. And then after a month, she got a job as a house maid and started to live alone. But Yewedianesh was not satisfied with this job. Hence, she joined another one, whose boss was not in good terms with her. In the end she was fined and left her job without even collecting her last salary.

The third job she got was relatively better, because she continued to work longer here and succeeded in getting her life time friend-Getaneh.

Getaneh was the son of Basha Yayeheyerad. In Yayeheyerad's home Yewedianesh's work responsibilities and duties were classified and assigned to her as follows:

[የወዲያነሽ] ዋናው ምድብ ሥራዋ ... የቤተሰቡን ልብሶች ማጠብና የምትችለውን መተኮሰ ሲሆን አልጋ ማንጠፍና ቤት መወልወል ተጨማሪ ሥራዋ ነበር።
(የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 32)

The main duty of [Yewedianesh] ... was to wash and iron the family's dresses. In addition to these, she had to make beds and clean (sweep) the house (floor).
(Yewedianesh, 1978: 32)

While Yewedianesh was executing her daily job and leading her life in this family, Getaneh, one of the family members was interested in her and was very glad when he heard her name for the first time, after her stay of six months in his family. So, when Getaneh tells us how he learnt Yewedianesh's name, and what he felt about her beauty and physical structure, he says this:

ሰሟን በመስማቱና በማወቁ ብቻ የመነሻው ምክንያት ያልተከሰተልኝ ሰውርና ብሩህ የሕሊና ደስታ ተሰማኝ መላው ሰውነቴ ተፍኅኅኅኅ፤
(የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 34)

Only because of learning and knowing her name, I felt deep at heart a mysterious and hidden happiness, the causes of which were not clear. Consequently, the whole of my body was overwhelmed by joy.
(Yewedianesh, 1978: 34)

Regarding Yewedianesh's physical beauty, Getaneh narrates and comments as follows:

የወዲያነሽ የእካሏ ቅርፅና አቋም እየተስተካከለ አግረ የተፈጥሮ
ውበቱና ቁንጅናዋ ከያደፈጡበት ፉካ ቀስ በቀስ እያዘገው
ወጡ። ጉንጮቿ ሞላ ብለው በትንቡክቡክ የወጣትነት ደምና
ሥጋ ጠረቁ ... ማለፊያ ወጣት ሆነች።

(የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 35)

Yewedianesh's physical structure and body features which are well arranged intensify her natural beauty to gradually flourish. Her fully blown cheeks also blossom because of her youthful blood and flesh ... which made her the best beautiful young girl.

(*Yewedianesh*, 1978: 35)

Therefore, Yewedianesh's beauty and physical structure became a very good reason for Getaneh to be attracted to her. So, he wished to have a love affair with her. Hence, he started to use every opportunity to describe his feeling to her. One day he got a chance of making Yewedianesh sleep in his own bedroom and was able to rape her. Getaneh describes when and how all the events happened as follows:

... ከገጠር የመጡ ጭሰኛ ሽማግሌ በየወዲያነሽ አልጋ ላይ እንዲተኙ ተደረገ። ... የወዲያነሽ ... ሰውነቷን የምታሳርፍበት ... አጣች። የእኔን ልዩ ርዳታ ለማግኘት ዐይኖቿ ... ተንከራተቱ። ... [እኔም] ... በአካባቢው ሰው ያለመኖሩን እንዳረጋገጥኩ ... የወዲያነሽ ነይ አሁን ለጊዜው እዚያ ተኚ ብዬ በከንደ ሰቢያት ገባሁ። እይዞሽ አትፍሪ! እዚህ እኔ አልጋ ላይ ወጥተሽ ተኚ ለንገህ ማንም አላየ ... ብዬ ... ከግማሽ ሰዐት በኋላ የድንግልናዋን ኬላ ጣስኩት ... የወዲያነሽ ኡኡ ልትል ስትል አፏን በአፊ ከደንኩት። ሕሊናዋን ስታ ጧ ብላ ተዘረረች...

(የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 60-63)

An old tenant who, came from the rural area was made to sleep on the bed of Yewedianesh... Yewedianesh then, had no bed to sleep on ... she was in need of my help. ... So her eyes were looking at me begging for help. Then, I checked the surroundings, ... and said to Yewedianesh: "Come on; sleep on that bed, for the time being" and then I pulled her by her hand into the room. I then said, "Do not be afraid! No body saw us when we entered the room. Come on! Sleep on my bed." Then after half an hour I took her virginity. In the process, Yewedianesh attempted to shout but I closed her mouth

with my whole mouth and soon she stretched out herself on the bed unconsciously.

(Yewedianesh, 1978: 60-63)

However, no body knew about the rape. No body knew what he did and what happened to Yewedianesh. Since then, he and Yewedianesh strengthened their sexual relation. Therefore, as a result of such a secret love, Yewedianesh became pregnant.

When Getaneh's mother learned about all this, it caused her to dismiss Yewedianesh from her job, and made her leave her domicile. So, Yewedianesh was forced to stay on the street as she had no relative to go to. Then she became one of the street girls.

Getaneh was very much worried about Yewedianesh's disappearance. Though he searched for her in the town, he did not get her and did not know the whereabouts of her.

On the other hand, when Yewedianesh's pregnancy period was over, she gave birth to a baby boy. Since she had no shelter for herself and her child, she took a hard and cruel measure on her new born baby. She laid the baby on the street, and vanished from the surroundings. She took such a measure for two reasons. One, the infant could be taken and be brought up by someone; and two, the child would die on the street. Fortunately, the first option came true, and a certain woman who passed by got the abandoned child; and reported to the police station. The police took the child and sent it to an orphanage, and at the same time began to search for the person who committed such a criminal act (offence).

In the search, Yewedianesh was identified, caught and then accused for a crime of abandoning a child on a street to die. So, after the police completed the investigation, Yewedianesh, appeared before a court; the court jury examined the

case and finally passed a verdict on Yewedianesh, sentencing her to six years imprisonment.

Her lover Getaneh discovered that Yewedianesh was in prison. So, from that day onwards he regularly visited her in the prison by keeping his promise he had given her while she was in his residence.

Through out Yewedianesh's imprisonment, Getaneh was at her side. He rendered the help she needed. When she became free after six years imprisonment, Getaneh took her to a house he rented for her. He also took out his son from the orphanage and brought him to his mother – Yewedianesh. This made Yewedianesh joyful. Getaneh added another joy to her by declaring to his conservative parents that he and their earlier house maid Yewedianesh, had started to lead a life under one roof as husband and wife.

However, when Getaneh's father learned that Yewedianesh and his son had started living under one roof, he became so upset and offended that he soon died as a result. The general picture of Getaneh's father at that moment as described in the story is as follows:

... የማፈቅራት ባለቤቱ የወዲያነሽ ይህች ናት! ብዬ የወዲያነሽን ከእግር እስከራሷ እየጓዘ አባቴ በንደት ጋዬ ... አሳድጌ፣ አሳድጌ ለዚህ ልብታ! አለና ራሱን በሁለት እጆቹ ያዘና እየተንገዳገደ ሄደ ... አልጋው ላይ ዘፍ አለ ... ከመቼውም ይልቅ ደም ብዛቱ መጨረሻ ደረጃ ላይ ደርሶ... ዐይኔ እያየው መታወሩን ተገነዘብኩ ... ጥቂትም ሳይቆይ በአልጋው ላይ ወደቀ... በሶስተኛው ቀን ቀብሩ ላይ ተገኘሁ።
(የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 351-353)

... I said that this is my wife Yewedianesh! whom I love and then I looked at her from the crown of her head to the sole of her feet. My father was offended... and said: 'Is this the favour I get from the son I brought up!' And then, he held his head with his hands and went staggering to his bed... and lied on it. More than any other day his blood pressure went so high that just in a moment under my eyes he became blind... and at the same time

he fell down on his bed ... Consequently, after three days I attended his burial ceremony.

(Yewedianesh, 1978: 351-353)

Getaneh's father passed away. The old passed, the new generation took the place of the old and Getaneh continued to live with his new out look. Indeed, the death of Getaneh's father is a symbol of the death of the obsolete old and reactionary out look. On the other hand, Getaneh and Yewedianesh began to live together as winners of the old idea of Getaneh's father, which reflected the inequality of man or human beings. The novel Yewedianesh this ended declaring the victory of the new marriage life of Getaneh and the house maid Yewedianesh.

3.4 Oromay

"It was written during the Red Star Campaign in Eritrea, where Bealu stayed for three months" (K. Molvaer, 1977: 346). The novel was published in 1975 E/C, and its main story is based on the Red Star Campaign, which took place in Eritrea during the Derge Regime. The novel focuses on the political situation of the then Ethiopian province of Eritrea.

The title of the novel "Oromay", according to Molvaer (1977: 343) means "now, at this moment." And the word "Oromay" is probably an Italo-Eritrean word which comes from Orami/Ormai.

This novel is presented in five chapters and in three hundred seventy one pages. The central character, as well as narrator of the story, is Tsegaye Hailemariam. Tsegaye is also characterized in the story as a TV journalist, and head of the Red Star Campaign Propaganda and Agitation Department.

When the Red Star Campaign was declared, Tsegaye had to go to Asmara to render professional service. So, he was one of the guests who were invited by the

then government to go to northern Ethiopia. On the day of his departure, Tsegaye narrates the following:

ሰኞ ማለፍ። ታህሳስ 19 ቀን 1974 ... ከጊዜ ልክ በአስራ ሁለት ሰዓት ቦሌ አለም አቀፍ አይሮፕላን ማረፊያ መገኘት ነበረብኝ ... የእጅ ቦርሳዬን አንጠልጥዬ ተነሳሁ። 'ትንሽ ነገር አፍህ ብታደርግ' አለኝኝ ሮማን... ይልቅ እንሂድ አልኳት ... ለሶስት ወር ያህል ተለይቻት ወደሰሜናዊ የኢትዮጵያ ክፍል ወደ አሥመራ በምሄድበት ቀን ... የቤቱን ቁልፍ በሙሉ ለሮማን ከሰጠኋት በኋላ ተያይዘን ወጣን።
(አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 7-8)

On Monday early morning Tahasas 19/1974... (December, 27/1981) at 12 a.m. (6a.m.), I had to be ... present at Bole International Airport. So, I picked up my hand bag (luggage) to go. At this occasion Roman asked me to eat something (breakfast)... but I told her that we should go ... on that day, when I had to leave Addis Ababa to stay for three months in northern Ethiopia, Asmara ... I gave all the keys of our home to Roman and left.

(*Oromay, 1975: 7-8*)

Tsegaye and Roman have been fiancée (lovers) for two years. Of course, they proposed and promised to have the marriage ceremony in January, 1974. However, the Red Star Campaign became an obstacle to their purpose. This is described by the narrator as follows:

ጥር አጋማሽ ላይ ልንጋባ አቅደን ነበር። ዝግጅቱን ከጀመርን ቆይተናል። ሁለታችንም የሠርጋችንን ዕለት በታላቅ ጉጉትና ናፍቆት ነበር የምንጠባበቀው ከተጫጨን ድፍን ሁለት ዓመት ሆኗል።
(አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 11)

In mid January, we decided to have our marriage ceremony. And both of us were waiting for the day (our marriage day) in a great eagerness and desire; of course, two solid years have already passed since we had been fiancées.

(*Oromay, 1975: 11*)

It was clear that Tsegaye's and Roman's marriage ceremony could not be held when Tsegaye left Roman in Addis and went to Eritrea because of the Red Star Campaign. When he reached Asmara, he was very busy; so, as soon as he

finished preparing his TV camera and other materials which were necessary for his journalistic mission, he went out to the city, with his assistants or colleagues to produce a TV program on peace. This is what Tsegaye says:

... አሥመራ የሕንሰ አራተኛ አውሮፕላን ማረፊያ ከደረሰኩበት ደቂቃ ጀምሮ ጊዜ አላጠፋሁም ... ለሚቀጥሉት ሦስት ወሮች ለማረፊያ ከተዘጋጀልን ከአሥመራ ቤተ መንግሥት በስተጀርባ ... ከሚገኘው ከዶክተር ዮሐንስ ቤት ደርሼ ጊዜያዊ አልጋዬ ላይ ሻንጣዬን ወርውራ ነበር ወዲያውኑ የወጣሁት 'የሰላም ዘንባባ' የተሰኘ የቴሌቪዥን ፕሮግራም ለመሥራት።

(አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 25-26)

Since I reached Yohannes Arategna (John IV) Airport in Asmara, ... I did not in fact waste any time. ... Just put my luggage at the place where I should stay for the next (coming) three months. This place was located behind Asmara Palace. ... It was Dr. Yohannes's house. I put my luggage on my bed, and then, immediately went out to produce a TV program, entitled "The Palm of peace" (Yeselam Zenbaba).

(Oromay, 1975: 25-26)

Then, Tsegaye continues to carry out his professional business. He produces a variety of TV programs and sends them to Addis Ababa Television Station to be broadcast. Along with this, he strictly fulfils the responsibility of agitation and propaganda work, entrusted on him. Besides executing these responsibilities, he also chairs a lot of meetings and gatherings, produces Radio and newspaper transcripts, and jams EPLF's radio broadcast and other programs under his supervision.

While Tsegaye was busy, and occupied by all these responsibilities, and duties, he got a chance to be introduced to a woman called Fiammetta. The introduction of Tsegaye and Fiammetta took place at one get together program (occasion) in Metsehafe Daniel's residence.

On the day of this get together, Fiammetta and the EPLF bandit known as Salia who surrendered to the Ethiopian government, attended the meeting together.

On this occasion, Tsegaye introduced himself to Fiammetta. When he tells us how this introduction takes place, he says:

ኮሎኔል ቤትሩ [ከሥዕላይ] ጋር የመጣቸው ልጅ ዐይኗን ጥላብሀለችና ሂድና አጫውታት አለኝ። ምናልባት አልኩና ወደ ልጅቱ ሄድኩ ምነው ብቻሽን ቆምሽ እቱ? ምን ትጠጪያለሽ? ምን ላምጣልሽ አልኳት ... መጠጧን አመጣሁላትና ፀጋዬ ኃይለማርያም እገላለሁ አልኳትና ማን ብዬ ልጥራሽ ... [ሰል] ሰጧን ጠየኳት 'ፊያሜታ ገላይ እገላለሁ' ብላ ሰጧን ነገረችኝ።
(አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 90-92)

Colonel Betru said to me: "The woman who came with Salia had been looking at you. Go and talk to her." Then I said to myself, "Perhaps it may be useful." And I moved to her and said: "Why do you stand alone sister? What would ... you like to drink? And what can I bring to you?" I brought her a drink and said to her: "I am Tsegaye Hailemariam. What can I call you?" ... She told me her name is: 'Fiammetta Gilaie.

(Oromay, 1975: 90-92)

After this occasion, Tsegaye and Fiammetta did not have a chance to meet soon again. However, after a month, when Roman Heletework phoned Tsegaye from Addis, he remembered Fiammetta in his mind, and then as soon as he finished his talk with Roman, he called for Fiammetta, and talked to her for a long time. And finally, they had an appointment to meet on a festival which would take place in Mittsawa.

Tsegaye and Fiammetta met at Mittssawa and enjoyed the festival. And since the day of the festival, they became intimate friends and lovers. However, EPLF began to interfere in order to cut short their love relation. Because of Tsegaye Hailemariam's profession, and the position he had in the government structure, as well as the role he played in the politics, EPLF (Eritrean People Liberation Front) decided that he has to be removed. So, to fulfil its mission, the group sent one of its members to make contact with Fiammetta, and told her what EPLF wanted of her. The following is what Fiammetta told Tsegaye about this issue and what the EPLF man asked her, she says:

ከጥቂት ሳምንታት በፊት አንድ ሰው ቤቱ መጥቶ ከፀጋዬ ኃይለማርያም ወይም ካንቺ ሕይወት አንዱን ምረጫ አለኝ። ሰውየው የሚፈለገው ነገር ግልፅ ነበር። አንተን ከተፈለገህት ቦታ በተወሰነው ዕለት ይገኛ እንደመጣ ነበር የፈለገው።

(አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 360)

A few weeks ago, a certain man came to my house, and said: 'Choose between your and Tsegaye Hailemariam's life.' Of course, the man's desire and need was clear. That was to hand you over to them on the time specified.

(Oromay, 1975: 360)

In fact, EPLF wanted to kickout Tsegaye. So, the man described the desire and decision of the bandit group to Fiammetta. However, Fiammetta did not have interest to collaborate with them in the conspiracy. Then in the middle of this situation, Tsegaye went to the war front to produce a TV program. When he returned from the front, the bandit group (EPLF), continued to request Fiammetta, to collaborate with them in kicking out him, and thus one day they gave order to her to bring Tsegaye to the place they wanted. But Fiammetta was not willing to do so; rather she wrote a letter to Tsegaye disclosing the whole situation and the total secret of the bandit group which she kept for herself. After Fiammetta wrote and sent the letter to her lover Tsegaye, she returned from her job place to her home. However, while she was ready to enter her compound, a certain man shot and hit her on her chest. After a while, Fiammetta passed away. When the narrator told us how Fiammetta died, he says:

እቁባይና ሁለቱ ሰዎች ፊያሜታ ጊላይን ሲከታተሉ ነበር የዋሉት። እንደነገረቻቸው ወደ ኒያላ በመሄድ ፋንታ ወደ ቤቷ በታክሲ ሄደች። በመኪና ተከተሏት። ቀድመው በሯ ላይ ጠበቋትና ከውጭ በር ላይ መንገድ ዘግተው ያዟት።

“ምንድ ነው አለች”

“እንድተነገረሽ ለምን አላደረግሽም?”

“አላደርግም”

“አንቺ የመንግሥት ሰላይ”

“አይደለሁም...”

በሁለት ጥይት ልቧ ላይ መተዋት ሮጡ

(አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 365)

The whole day, Equbiye and other two persons were secretly following Fiammetta. Fiammetta did not go to Nyala Hotel as she

told them. Rather (instead) she took a taxi and went to her residence. They followed her with a car and, as they reached her residence before here, they blocked her way and caught her. At this moment, she said: "What is it?"

"Why didn't you do as you told ነገሩ?"

"I shall not do it."

"You are the state's spy!"

"I am not..."

They shot her with two bullets on her chest and run away.

(Oromay, 1975: 365)

Fiammetta, took this risk for the sake of Tsegaye. At the burial ceremony of Fiammetta, Roman Heletework was present. She was in Asmara to visit her lover Tsegaye. The presence of Roman on Fiammetta's burial ceremony was unexpected and a surprise to him. Also it was an exposition of his secret love to Fiammetta.

When Roman discovered that Tsegaye had broken his promise, she insisted to break her promise too. Therefore, just in the grave yard of Fiammetta, Roman took out the ring she was wearing on her finger as a sign of promise to marry Tsegaye, and threw it to the ground before Tsegaye's eyes. This was an unfortunate situation in which he lost Fiammetta in death, and again Roman in life.

On the other hand, the Red Star Campaign which cost a big sacrifice and struggle could not come to an end victoriously. The then Ethiopian government soldiers were unable to defeat the EPLF bandits, and get rid of them from their Nakifa base. Of course, the war front was not in a limited area and location, but it was dispersed in all sides and in different parts of Eritrea. A formal and informal war was fought by EPLF. For instance, in Asmara there was a "war" front going on underground. The leader of this "front" was "Oromay", who was known as Salie Berahi. He was a known EPLF spy who surrendered himself to the then

Ethiopian government and deceived the state by giving underground service to EPLF. He was sending useful information to the bandit group.

On the other hand, Addis Ababa was the other “war front”. In Addis, there was a man called Bureaucracy, who centered with his groups in the city, with the responsibility of evaluating the government’s strength in relation to the war going on in Eritrea, and the activities of spying the overall situation, and sending messages to EPLF. So, EPLF was collecting information from different directions and locations and using it properly to win the war. Besides, by fighting devotedly, it was able to win the Red Star Campaign.

The failure of then Ethiopian army to defeat EPLF in the Red Star Campaign created a question in the mind of Mestehafe Daniel. In fact, it has been a riddle to him. Therefore, he says:

ይህን ሁሉ ጦር አሰልፈን? ይህን ሁሉ ዝግጅት አድርገን
ናቅፋን መያዝ እንደት ያቅተናል? ምን ነውኩ ችግራችን? ወይስ
ከኛ የተሰወረ ነገር ይኖራል? ማነውኩ ይህን እንቆቅልሽ
የሚያስረዳኝ?

(አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 3338)

With a big army and full preparation, why couldn't we control Nakifa? What is our problem? Or is there something secret hidden from us? Who can explain the meaning of such a riddle?

(*Oromay*, 1975: 338)

In fact, it is a timely riddle for a giant army, well equipped and well trained, to be defeated by gorilla fighters.

Here is then that the whole story of the novel Oromay has come to its conclusion. It concluded with the death of Fiammetta, failure of Red Star Campaign, and Tsegaye Hailemariam’s loss of Roman, Fiammetta, and Red Star Campaign.

Now we shall pass to examine features exhibited and techniques used in the narratives of Settegnāna Adari, Enbutte Tsigerida, Yewedianesh, and Oromay.

CHAPTER FOUR

FEATURES EXHIBITED AND TECHNIQUES USED IN THE NARRATIVES (Settegñña Adari, Enbutte Tsigerida, Yewedianesh and Oromay)

This section presents the different features and writing techniques of the four different novels referred above exhibit.

4.1 Features in Settegñña Adari

Settegñña Adari is a narrative told by the main character — Inanu. It is presented in a straightforward story telling method which follows “a birth to death” story telling line. Because of this, the story begins with Inanu’s rural childhood life followed by her first and unsuccessful marriage story. Next comes other life experiences, such as Inanu's migration from the rural area to Addis Ababa, and her life of prostitution in the city. As a result of this, the novel is categorized as a “simple narrative” which presents the events of the story in a style and manner of their natural orders and happenings. In other words it gives priority to the natural order of the events or recounting of the events rather than to the cause and effect relationships of events in the story.

Another feature reflected in this novel is the absence of a central conflict. Since the narrative is a simple narrative recounting events of the story, one can not trace a central conflict in it. In fact, according to Taye Assefa (1986: 99), Settegñña Adari “... does not raise, develop and resolve any specific central conflict as such.” This means the novel does not have a developed, grand conflict; so its plot is not also complex. Nevertheless, it does not mean that the novel is

totally without conflict. In other words, some petty conflicts can be traced here and there in the novel. For instance, a conflict between Inanu and her first husband, a conflict between her and Woube Berha's Night Club Women etc. can be mentioned.

Again, not going straight to the main story line is the other feature exhibited in this novel. It is known that the main story line of Settegñña Adari is Inanu's life history. However, sometimes the narrative diverts from it, and other issues and matters are narrated. When Taye Assefa writes about such a feature of this novel, he said: "[The novel Settegñña Adari]... tends to lean outwardly, away from [the life history of Inanu] towards the profession itself..." (Ibid.: 106). In fact, by diverting from the narration of the life history of Inanu, prostitution and prostitutes are discussed by far in most part of the novel. The discussion also focuses on the characterization and classification of the profession, as well as on the people who participate in it and on the customers of Woube Berha. In addition to this, group making and characterizing different phenomena rather than recounting the life history of Inanu are the other issues that can be raised as features of this narrative. For instance, the following is the characterization of the lady who is engaged in the prostitution business:

እንዲት ሴት በሽርሙጥና ሥራ ለመኖር ... ቢያንስ ቢያንስ
 ከሚቀጥሉት ሦስት ነገሮች አንዱ ሊኖራት ይገባል። አንደኛው እጅግ
 የሚያስደንቅ ውበትና ፍፁም የሆነ ገላ ቅርፅ (ፎርም) ... ሁለተኛው
 ወንድ ደጋግሞ እንዲመለከታት የሚያስገድድ ... ወይም የሚሰብ
 ባህሪ፣ ሦስተኛው ወንድ የማግባባት ችሎታ ...

(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 46)

A woman who wants to sustain in a prostitution business must at least have to fulfil one of the following three criteria: first, she must be elegant and pretty with a perfect body form; second, she must have special characteristics which attract a man towards her; and; third, she must embody a persuasive and lobbying personality to a man.

(Settegñña Adari, 1956: 46)

As it is shown in the above example, there are also many other instances in the novel, which involve grouping and categorizing of events. Apart from this feature, the other characteristic that could be attributed to this novel is its style or story telling method.

So, the phrase “once upon a time” which is frequently seen in a “tale story” is used in most parts of the novel; and thus, the story (the novel) seems “a tale” story. The following brief examples, taken from the novel can make the idea very clear: “ከእለታት አንድ ቀን ሌላ ቦታ አምሽቶ...” (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 15). “Once upon a time ... while he was away at night ...” (Setegeñña Adari, 1956: 15). “ከእለታት አንድ ቀን ገላፀ ... ማበጡን አይቼ ደነገጥኩ” (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 21) “Once upon a time, ... I was shocked, when I saw my body swelling” (Setegeñña Adari, 1956: 21). “ከእለታት አንድ ቀን ... ሐና ከተኛሁበት ቀስቅሳ አስነሳችኝ” (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 61). “Once upon a time Hana woke me up.”

Therefore, in the above examples, it is clear to see how frequently the phrase, “Once upon a time” has been used in the narrative. Besides, Journalistic writing and presentation is another feature which one can observe in Setegeñña Adari. To objectively clarify this idea and for a better understanding, let me put some instances from the novel itself:

ዛሬ [ቅዳሜ] ህዳር 3 ቀን 1956 ዓ.ም. ሐሳቤን ... በወረቀት ላይ ማስፈር ጀመርኩ ... ከዚህ በተጨማሪው ቅዳሜ ዕለት ... አንድ ገላው ኩስስ ያለ ሰው መጠጥ ቤቱ ገብቶ ጥግ ይዞ ተቀመጠ
(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 7-8፣ 17) (መስመር የተጨመረ)

Today [Saturday] 3rd of November, 1956, I began to write down my idea... on paper. On the referred Saturday, a man whose body was very thin, entered the drinking house and sat at the corner.
(Setegeñña Adari, 1956: 7-8, 17) (underlying mine)

The above underlined phrases which are cited as examples, and others which are not mentioned here can obviously indicate the journalistic way of writing the writer employs. They are not creative in style. Journalistic writing differs from others in its use of dry facts and evidence. These dry facts and others referred above ascertain this phenomenon.

Repetitions of words and phrases are other features of Settegeñña Adari. Different English words which are written in Amharic letters are other features of the narrative. For instance, among the many words which are written in Amharic letters, the following are presented as examples:

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| “ኦክስፔሪያንስ”(ገፅ 8) | “ሶሻያል ፕሮብሌም” (ገፅ 8) |
| “Experience”(p. 8) | “Social Problem” (p. 8) |
| “ሾርት”(ገፅ 49) | “ማይ ላቭ” (ገፅ 62) |
| “Short”(p. 49) | “My Love” (p. 62) |

Another characteristic of the novel is that the events and actions that happen in the story are told rather than shown. Hence, the characters who carry out the actions of the story are most of the time passive because their participation is simply reported by the narrator. Thus, make the narrative dull and unattractive.

So far, these are some features which could be traced in Settegeññ Adari. Now we shall pass to examine the narrative features of Enbutte Tsigerida novel.

4.2 Features in Enbutte Tsigerida

First of all, Enbutte Tsigerida is presented in an ulterior narration method. A method which helps to present a story from its dead end towards its beginning. In other words, Enbutte Tsigerida is presented in a flashback writing technique.

So, because of the technique the novel presented, it is possible to say that the narrative is an inter plotted narrative: “A narrative which recounts or represents events that happen before the point of which the work (story) opened” (Abrams:139)
 For example, when the narrator begins to tell the story, she says:

... የማልፈልገውን አፍ አውጥቼ ‘አልወድህም! አልፈልግህም!’
 በማለቱ ነበር ከማልወጣው የመከራ ማጥ ውስጥ የተዘፈቅሁት
 ... ንፁህ ደሜ የፈሰሰው፣ መንፈሴ የተሸበረው ምሽት ላይ
 በመሆኑ እኔን ጨለማ ያሳስፈራኝ ... ማንን ሊያስፈራው ይሆን?
 (እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፡ 10)

... It was because of boldly uttering that: ‘I don’t like and love you!’ to the man that I don’t want to love, that I faced such a suffering. ... I was disvirgined, and my pure blood was poured. All these happened at night. So, if the darkness of the night did not frighten me, whom could it frighten then?
 (Enbutte Tsigerida, 1982: 10)

From the above quotation, it is clear to understand that the narrator tells the event of the situation she was in once in the past; and the events happened to her at that moment. Of course, she was found in a depressed mood and situation because of the things which happened to her at that particular time. What caused her suffering? Who was the man whom she did not want to love? What, and who was the cause of her bleeding? What was the suffering in which she found herself at that moment? So, to learn the answers of these questions, a reader has to read it from the dead end of the story to its beginning. Here then, according to the writing pattern of Enbutte Tsigerida, priority has been given to the story’s plot and thus a chronological presentation of events and actions is not observable. Therefore, the structuring of the novel plotwise is one of the features detected in the narrative.

Another feature of Enbutte Tsigerida is the issue of putting aside the main story of Mestawat and dealing with other ‘philosophical’ issues and argumentations. Specific examples include the extensive argumentation which

takes place between Dr. Terefe and Captain Amha on the issue of bureaucracy and bureaucratic life (In the novel Chapter Three pp.56-86), the dialogue that is held between Dr. Terefe and Mestawat about the beauty of a woman and a marriage (Chapter One pp. 23-29) and the story of Abbeye (pp.34-39) which concerns Mestawat and Gedlu.

The other feature traced in the narrative of Enbutte Tsigerida is the application of the (traditional) story telling method. The following quotation asserts this phenomenon:

ውድ አንባቢያን ሆይ! ... በገፍኩት ትውስታዬ ከናንተ ጋር ከተዋወቅሁ በኋላ ቀስ በቀስ ወደሌላ ታሪክ ዘልቄ በመግባቴ የተነሳሁበትን አልዘነጋሁምና እስኪ ወደነበርንበት ልመልሳችሁ ...
 (እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 319)
 (መስመር ዳተኛ መረጃ)

Dear Readers! ... after I introduced myself to you in my writing, I gradually went deep into another story. However, this does not mean that I had forgotten the former point. Therefore, let me take you back to that point once again...

(Enbutte Tsigerida, 1982: 319) (underlying mine)

The phrases underlined in the quotation “Dear Readers;” and “Let me take you back to that point once again” are signs of the traditional story telling method. Hence, such kind of writing style makes the quality poor, and limits the beauty of the narrative.

Even though Enbutte Tsigerida, has a central conflict, which is raised between Gedlu and Mestawat, it is not resolved, or comes to a resolution at the conclusion of the story. This phenomenon could be one of the significant features that can be pointed out in the novel (Narrative). To support this idea with evidence, let us have a glance at the following quotation:

ሲያልፍ እንደዋሃ ሆነና ትውስታዬ በቀላሉ ሊተረክ ቢበቃም፣ ዛሬም የልቤ ትርታ በገድሉ ለማና በማርታ ዮሐንስ ላይ እጆን እንዳነሳ የበቀል ስሜት ይነተጉተኛል ... የተዳፈነው የልቤ ውስጥ እሳት የተጫረ ለታ ... ገድሉን አያድርገኝ ... ማርታን አያድርገኝ ... ጊዜው ሲደርስ እሳቴ ደመኞጅን ይለበልባቸዋል።
 ተፈፀመ። (እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 319)

Things happen and pass away instantly without my awareness though my recollections could be easily retold. My inner feelings urge me to revengefully murder Gedlu Lemma and Martha Yohanis. If the hidden fire of revenge is blazing in my heart, ... nobody wishes to be Gedlu ... or ... Martha. The fire will burn my enemies when that revengeful day comes.
The end. (Enbutte Tsigerida, 1982: 319)

In the above quotation the description given by Mestawat indicates that the conflict that arose between Mestawat and Gedlu and continued upto the end of the story has not been resolved. This was because even after two years Mestawat still remembered what Gedlu and Martha had done to her and thought of revenging on them one day in the future.

4.3 Features in Yewedianesh

Yewedianesh, is a novel full of descriptions of things, actions, and events. In fact, unnecessary description of things and different phenomena is the main feature of the narrative. So, this phenomenon can have a bad influence on the tempo of the narrative. For instance, in most chapters of the novel we can trace the unnecessary and extensive descriptions of the physical structure of characters, their habits, as well as the settings they dwell in. For example, let us see the following description of the people who were once in the Addis Ababa Higher Court compound:

ጠበቆች፣ ዳኞችና ፀሐፊዎች ጫማ ጠራጊዎችና ሥራ ፈቶች፣ እንደ ኑሮ ደረጃቸው ለብሰው በመምጣት የፍርድ ቤቱን አካባቢ ... ገበያ አስመሰሉት። አንዳንዶቹ ሰዎች የለበሱት [ልብስ] ... የተቀደደ ያረጀ ... በተለያየ የጨርቅ ዓይነት የተጣጣፈ ኮትና ሱሪ ... ከተወለወለ ወራት ያለፉትና የቆዳው ቀለሙ የተገጣጠበ ... ቀዳዳው የአሳ አፍ የመሰለ ጫማ [ያደረጉ] ... ለአያሌ አመታት የተንገላቱና የተጎሳቆሉ ባለጉዳዮች ናቸው ... የተሰበሰበ በውን ሰው በዝርዝር ሲያዩት እያንዳንዱ የራሱ የሆነ ታሪክ ያለው መሆኑ ያስታውቃል። አንዳንዱ ብቻውን ቆሞ እጁን እያወራጩ ከራሱ ጋር ይሟገታል። አብዛኛው ... ሰው ይህ ልክ ነው የለም ይህ ሐሰት ነው! ለዚህ በቂ ነቃሽ አለኝ ... ይላል። የከፍተኛው ፍርድ ቤት ግዙፍ ሕንፃ ታላቅ የመከራ ተራራ መሰሉ ፊት ለፊት ተገትሯል።

(የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 134)

Lawyers, judges and clerks, shoe shiners and the unemployed who were dressed according to their living standards gathered --- like a market crowd in the (Addis Ababa) Higher Court compound. Some of these people were dressed in old, torn and mended coats and trousers ... as well as old shoes which were unpolished for months and had holes so big like the mouth of a fish.... They were people who had a long time of grief and suffering.... When one thoroughly looked at these gathered people one by one, it was evident that each particular person certainly had his or her own history. Some of them talked to themselves by standing separately and restlessly moving their hands. The majority ... of them were saying: "This is right; no, that is false! I can bring many eye witnesses for this." Nevertheless, the giant Higher Court building stands in front, just like a huge mountain of hardships.

(Yewedianesh, 1978: 134)

The other feature that can be mentioned in this narrative is that of the repetitions of phrases, words and other events. The following quotation illustrates these repetitions of words and phrases:

ሐሳቤ ቢሰማማሽም ባይሰማማሽም ... ገብራራልሽ ቆርጫለሁ።
ሐሳቤን ለማቀነባበር ጥቂት ዝም አልኩ ... የከበደ ሐሳብ
 አእምሮይ ውስጥ ማንኛባቸውን ቀጠለ። ... ሐሳቤን የምቀሰቅስበት
 ... ምክንያት በማጣቱ ሐሳቤ አእምሮይ ውስጥ ... ተያዘ። ሐሳብ
ለማቀነባበር ያህል ትንፋሼን ዋጥኩ።

*(የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 250-252)
 (መዝገብ ጻፋዬ ሀገራ)*

Whether my idea is suitable or not ... I am determined to elaborate it for you." I kept quiet for a short time to think it over and arrange my idea. A very big idea began to circulate in my mind. Since I did not get any reason to forward my idea, ... it was held back in my mind. To take a breath and think over my idea again I paused for a moment.

(Yewedianesh, 1978: 250-252) (Underlying mine)

As shown, the underlined phrases and words are seen repeatedly coming in the narrative. Moreover, the structure of the phrases and the words used in them are mostly similar.

Apart from this, the narrative of Yewedianesh is full of figures of speech, such as similes, proverbs, personification etc. which are extensively used through out. This phenomenon is taken as one of the features reflected in it. Again most of the actions and events of the story are told by the narrator rather than being done by the characters, and thus it is taken more as a telling narrative rather than showing. All of these features described so far can be easily traced in Yewedianesh.

4.4 Features in Oromay

The first striking feature of Oromay is a shifting of point of view. The novel begins its story with an introduction by the real author. The author introduces the narrator of the novel Tsegaye Hailemariam. After the introduction, Tsegaye continues the narration. When Tsegaye stops it somewhere in the middle, another character or the real author comes into his shoes and takes over the narrating responsibility. So, such a relay of story telling system is one of the features that is detected in the novel. Most of Oromay's narrative (story) is presented in a dialogue and is as well descriptive. In fact, this picture is one of the features recognized in the narrative.

Language use is the other point of focus in Oromay's narrative. Of course, the language in the story is elevated. This is because the paragraphs are structured with long and short sentences, words used are simple, and common. However, sometimes the author tells the story by shifting from Amharic to Tigrigñña without even giving the Amharic translations at all. For example, the dialogue that takes place between Fiammetta and Tsegaye, the poem stated on page 205, and the sub-topic given on page 48 and others are some of the instances that could be traced the novel. The following conversation and poem is presented in Tigrigñña which has no Amharic translation:

“ጽቡቕ መስተ እየ”
“ትግርኛ ትዛረብ ዲኻ”
“እወ ቀሩብ ቀሩብ” (አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 90)

“ሄ ሉ?”
“አበይ አዩ?”
“መንክብል?”
“ፊያሜታ ...”
“ሰሜናዊት ጽብቕቲ፣ ከመይቀኒ ... ፀጋዬ ኃይለማርያም ዝብሐል
ትዝክርኒ ዶ?”
“እንቴ እሂዳኣ? (አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 155)

“ድጎሪ ቀትሪ”
“ኤ! ማ ንርዳንፓ” (አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 141)

አብ ከተማ ምጽዋዕ ጥቅ ደንደስ ባከሪ
ትዝ ኢሉ ተዘኪሩኒ ዘሕለፍኩዎ ፍቕሪ
ፀሐይ ዕረርቦ እዋን ምስይ ምስበለ
እቲ ሙቀት ጠፊኡ ምድሪ'ውን ዘሐለ
(አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 205)

The other feature of this (Oromay) novel is that, the characters are seen actively participating in the actions and events of the story. So most of the time, they are active in the novel. It is too little that is told about each of them by the narrator of the story. Therefore, the whole narrative can be considered as a showing, rather than a telling one.

4.5 Narrative Techniques Reflected in the Novels

In a creative writing, different types of narrative techniques can be reflected. For example, certain types of narrative techniques such as description, dialogue, flashback, etc. could be available. This section therefore tries to examine the different types of writing techniques which are employed in the four novels namely: Settegñña Adari, Enbutte Tsigerida, Yewedianesh and Oromay.

4.5.1 Description and Dialogue

Description and dialogue are the two kinds of narrative techniques which are used in the novels mentioned above. Let us begin with description. This is a technique which attempts to create the picture of the setting of a certain story, the physical and mental conditions of characters, and the like. According to Shaw (1972: 110-11) description is:

... a form of discourse which tells how something looks, tastes, smells, sounds, feels, or acts. It deals with things, people, animals, places, scenes, moods, and impressions. The primary purposes of description are to portray a sense impression and to indicate a mood. It tries to make the impression or mood as vivid, as real, as life like for the reader or hearer...

So, the importance of this technique is to create a scene, mood, action etc. of a certain story. To draw in the minds of readers the general actions of characters, setting where a particular story takes place, and other impressions of the things in a story.

Now, let us have a look at the following description of the main character Inanu and the narrator of the novel, Settegñña Adari. This description which begins the story is presented as follows:

... ቁመቴ ዘለግ ያለ ነው ... ጠጉሬ ልሰልሰ ሆኖ ሐር የመሰለ ጥቁር ነው። ዐይኖቼ ጎላ ጎላ ብለው ክብ ከሆነው ፊቴ መካከል ... ጉብ ብለዋል። ቅንድቦቼ ሳልኳ በተፈጥሮ የተኳሉ መሰለው ስለሚታዩ ... ለፊቴ በመጠኑም ቢሆን ግርማና ጌጥ ሰ ጥተውታል። ጥርሶቼ ... ውሀ ዳር የተከለከሉ ነጭጭ እሞሮች ይመስላሉ።

(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 33-34)

I am a little bit tall. ... and my hair is soft, and black as silk. My big eyes are bulging in the ... centre of my round face. My eyelashes, which are shadowed in nature ... give grace and beauty to my face. My teeth look like white pigeons arranged in a row along the side of water.

(Settegññ Adari, 1956: 33-34)

The physical structure of the main character Inanu is described as shown in the above quoted text. The description is given by Inanu herself. She is the narrator of Settegnāna Adari and hence, has portrayed herself to the readers. Inanu, according to her description, is a tall woman with bulging eyes and soft hair. She is a woman gifted with beautiful eyelashes which seemed naturally shadowed to give grace to her face. So, this description of the physical appearance of Inanu is helpful to the reader to distinguish her from other characters in the novel, and at the same time to help the reader visualize some parts of her body form or structure.

Again, here is another description, which focuses on the setting, where war has taken place:

ከፍታ ነጥብ 1702 ትልቅ ተራራ ... የናቅፋ በር ቀልፍ ነው
 እየተጣ የሚነገርለት ከናቅፋ እየር ሜዳ በስተጀርባ በአራት
 ኪሎሜትር ርቀት ላይ የሚገኝ ስትራቴጂካዊ ተራራ ነው። ይህን
 ገዥ መሬት ከያዙ የናቅፋን በር ለመቆጣጠር ይቻላል።
 (አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 294)

The great mountain with a position code of 1702 ... is said to be the key passage to Nakifa. This strategic mountain is found at a distance of four kilometers behind Nakifa's Aeroplane Station. When this strategic mountain comes under control, it is possible to control the passage to Nakifa.

(Oromay, 1975: 294)

This great mountain identified as code number 1702 is a door way to Nakifa. According to the given description, it is a strategic place. Therefore to control this place means to make the Shabia surrender. Therefore, the importance of controlling this mountain is described being a key to opening a closed door. In fact, the description given to this mountain makes the mountain unforgettable to the readers of Oromay not only because of its code number 1702 but also because of being it is a strategic place.

Description, as mentioned earlier, is a very important device in creative writing. As a narrative technique it helps authors to describe things, characters, tastes,

situations, weather conditions, etc. For instance, the following is a description of a certain day weather condition:

እሁድ ማለፍ ነበር። ሰማዩ ... በደመና ተሸፍኗል። ብን ብን የምትለዋ ካፊያ ካያና ሰለገዋ በእንደ ላይ ተጠራማ እንደ ሙሉ ኮልልታ በመሆን ትንጠፈጠፋለች። ፀሐይ በወፍ ላይ ጉምና ደመና በመሸፈኗ ጨረጌ ከደመናው ጣራ በላይ ውሏል። ዕለቱ ተሰፋ የቆረጠ ሰው ፊት መስሎ ፈገገታ አጥቷል።
(የውዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 98)

It was an early Sunday morning. The sky was covered with a summer time cloud. There was very little rain where twenty or thirty tiny bits constitute a drop of water through time. Being covered by a thick fog and cloud, the sun and its rays stay high above the clouds. The day lacks brightness, and it seems just like the face of a hopeless man who does not smile.
(*Yewedianesh, 1978: 98*)

The weather is very cold. The day is foggy and the sky is covered with clouds. Rays of the sun can not reach the ground and heat the atmosphere. They rather stay above the clouds. So the bad weather is compared with a man who has become desperate in life. Therefore, such kinds of description help the reader to imagine and sense the whole situation of the day.

Here is another instance of description which focuses on the action of a character:

... እግራ የምለውን ... ተሸከርካሪ ወንበር (ዌልፍር) ወደ እኔ ሳብኩና በዝግታ ተንፏቅቆ ጉብ አልኩበት። ወደ ሸንት ቤት ላመራ ስዘጋጅ የአጥራችን የቆርቆሮ መዝጊያ ድንገት ተንኳኳ ... “ማን ይሆን?” ብዬ ወደ ሳሉን ሄድኩና የመሰከቱን መጋረጃ ገልጬ አሻግራ ተመለከትኩ። ... ሰውዬው በዘደ ... መዝጊያውን ከፍቶ ገባ ...
(እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 14)

...I pulled the wheel-chair towards me which I consider as my feet ... and slowly moved myself and sat on it. When I was ready to go to the toilet ... suddenly I heard the sound of the gate with a tin door. I said to myself ‘Who is that?’ and then went to the Salon room and by pulling the curtain, I looked through the window. A certain man systematically opened the gate door and entered the compound.
(*Enbutte Tsigerida, 1982: 14*)

The above text describes the action of Mestawat. Mestawat is the main character and narrator of the novel Enbutte Tsigerida. What she was doing at a particular moment and her physical condition are described in detail. According to the stated description of her action, this character is indirectly shown to be physically injured and crippled by way of describing her movement to the toilet. When she went to the toilet, she had to use a wheel-chair. This clearly shows that this character could not walk on her feet. Therefore, the description given on the action of Mestawat makes readers learn about her physical condition.

So far, we have observed from the few instances analyzed here how description technique is used in the novels under study. In the same manner, we shall examine again how dialogue is applied as a literary technique in the same novels.

Dialogue creates room for a face-to-face talking of characters in literary works. It is a conversation of characters which is short and dramatic. According to the explanation given by Shaw (1972: 113) a dialogue is:

A conversation, speaking together [which] involves an exchange of opinions or ideas and is used in narrative, poetry, short stories, novels and plays to reveal characters and to advance action.

So, dialogue as a literary technique it helps to reveal characters, and advance their actions. Moreover, when writers use this technique in their writings, they create a sense of immediacy and make the story life-like.

Hence-forth, we shall observe this technique by taking some examples from the novels. This is the first example from the novel, Yewedianesh:

“ ሰሜ ማካው? ” ...
“ አላውክውም ” ...
“ እኔ ምንህ ነኝ? ”
“ አላውክሽም እኔ እንጂ... ”
“ እናትህን ታውቃለህ? ”

“አይ የለኝም”...
“የት ሄደች አይተሀት አታውቅም?”...
“አላየኋትም... እ... እናት የለኝም”...

(የውዲያነሽ፣ 1978፡ 182)

“What is my name?”...
“I don't know”...
“Do you know the kind of relation I have with you?”
“I don't know you!”
“Do you know your mother?”
“No, she is not present”...
“Where did she go? Have you ever seen her?”...
“I didn't see her... E! ... I have no mother”...

(Yewedianesh, 1978: 182)

The above conversation which takes place between Yewedianesh and a baby son is an instance of a dialogue. With this dialogue the author of the novel attempts to reveal what Yewedianesh thinks of the child, and what the child replies to Yewedianesh. In fact, as revealed from the child's response, one important thing has been disclosed: that the baby has no knowledge of his mother. Actually, he was brought up in an Orphanage and so could not have any expectation of the woman he was talking to was his mother, though Yewedianesh wanted him to recognise her as his mother. That is why she asks: “Do you know what kind of relation I have with you?”

As shown above, the conversation of the two characters is presented in a very short and clear way. Because of its dramatic nature it enables readers to be at ease and follow up the story. Here is again another example of a dialogue:

“ነገ መሄደ ነው”...
“ወደት?”
“ወደአፋአበት”
“መቼ ትመለሳለህ?”
“ካልሞትኩ ከድል በኋላ”
አትሞትም። ጀግና አይሞትም።”

(አሮማይ፣ 1975፡ 103)

"Tomorrow, I will go"...
"Where?"
"To Afabet"
"When will you come back?"

"If I don't die, probably after victory"
"You will not die. A hero will not die."

(Oromay, 1975: 103)

Colonel Tariku Woleday and Tsegaye Hailemariam were speaking in the above dialogue. Colonel Tariku from Asmara was ready to go to Afabet, the place where there was war was going on. He was not certain of his return to Asmara. Tsegaye asked him the date of his return to Asmara by saying: "When will you come back?" The colonel answered "After victory, if I do not die." In his response, the colonel gave a hint of his probable death at the war front. That was why he could not give the exact date. On the other hand, colonel Tariku was a military hero; this was described by Tsegaye Hailemariam in his conversation with Tariku as mentioned above. So, in his last word Tsegaye said to the colonel: "You will not die. A hero will not die." This conversation which took place between the two characters helps to express the very broad idea in a short and perfect way.

Similarly, in the following quotation two persons are exchanging ideas. Let us follow their conversation:

"እህላ ... ቤት ደህና?..."
"በጣም ደህና ነን"...
"የት ነበርሽ? መኝታ ቤት ወይስ ...?"
"እረ ገና ከአልጋቼ መውረድ ነው።"
"በጣም ጥሩ! ጤና ለመሆንሽ ገፅሽ ይናገራል ..."
እግርሽም ቢሆንኮ... ቀላል ነው ትድኛለሽ..."

(እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 15)

"Okay! ... How is your family?..."
"We are all okay"
"Where have you been? In the bed room or...?"
"I am just getting up"

“Very good! your face also expresses that you are healthy ... Even the problem with your feet is so simple, it will be healed soon”
(*Enbutte Tsigerida, 1982: 15*)

The two persons talking are Mestawat and Dr. Terefe. They are talking in Mestawat’s residence. Since she was a crippled woman, he came to visit her. In fact, during his visit Mestawat’s health was found to be better. Any way, he expressed his sympathy, and encouraged her by saying that she would soon recover from her sickness.

Again let us have a look at the following dialogue taken from Settegnāna Adari:

“ማከሀ አንተ?
“እኔ ነኝ”
“ስም የለህም?”
“ሞልቶኛል። አንዱ ሰሜ አብጦ ነው”
“ሰዓት አልፏል አቶ አብጦ አይከፈትም”
“የምትፈልገው ገንዘብ ከበራፍሽ መጥቷል ምን ትጠብቁያለሽ?”

“ገንዘብ አልፈልግም”
“በነፃ ከሆነማ ተስማማን”

(*ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 196፣ 113*)

“Who are you?”
“It’s me”
“Don’t you have a name?”
“I have a lot. One of my names is Abette,”
“Mr. Abette, it is too late. I will not open the door for you.”
“The money which you are after is at the gate of your door. Why do you hesitate?”
“I don’t want any money”
“Okay! If it is free, that is fine.”

(*Settegnāna Adari, 1956: 113*)

In the above dialogue, Abette and Inanu were exchanging their ideas. The time was late at night and Inanu had already slept. So when Abette asked her to open the door, she was not willing. There was a misunderstanding between them. Abette thought that he could do what he wanted at any time as long as he had

the money. That was why he said to Inanu: "The money which you are after is at the gate of your door..." However, Inanu was not interested in Abette's money as she was afraid of the curfew. Consequently, she decided not to open the door and let him in.

To conclude the issue of dialogue, let me put my last remarks in a few words. Dialogue as it has been said earlier, is used as a narrative technique. We have observed from the few examples analyzed that it creates a sense of immediacy between the story being narrated and the reader; it also helps authors to present their stories in a short and vivid way. Hence, most of the time writers are seen using this technique extensively.

4.5.2 Flash Back and Foreshadowing

Flash back and Foreshadowing are two other narrative techniques used in literary works. When both of these narrative techniques are applied in literary works, they have different purposes. The former uses to recall or remember past events and situations, and the latter foretells or indicates the coming conditions in the process of a certain story.

When Hawthorn (1985: 94) writes about these two writing techniques she stated as follows:

The plot of a novel may move backwards and forwards in time instead of proceeding steadily forward in a chronological order. Any deviation from such strict chronological progression is termed as anachrony by narrative theorists, and there are a large number of such deviations possible. The most frequent are analepsis (flash back) and prolepsis (flash wards).

In order to clarify flash back and foreshadowing, I shall raise some instances from the novels which I am dealing with. First, a flash back narrative technique will be dealt with. Let us have a look at the following quotation from Yewedianesh:

የወዲያ! አባትሽ ሲሞቱ የሰንት ዓመት ልጅ ነበርሽ? ... አባቱ ሲሞት እንዲት ፍሬ ልጅ ነበርኩ አሉ። ... እናቴም አባትሽ ከልጆቹ ሁሉ እንቺን ይወድሽ ነበር። ሳይንት የሚባል አገር ካሉት ዘመዶቹ መሃል የሚወዳትን አክስቱን ስለምትመስይ ... የወዲያሽ የወዲያ ሰው ብሉ ስም አወጣልሽና ... የወዲያሽ አልንሽ ብላ ነገረችኝ።

(የወዲያሽ፣ 1978፣ 211-212)

Yewedia! How old were you when your father died? As I was told, I had been a little child at that time, Yewedianesh said.

My mother used to tell me that “your father loved you much more than all of his other children. This was because you resemble his aunt whom he loved much more than all his relatives living in the place called Saint”. According to her it was as a result of this that your father originally named you Yewedianesh. She said that she herself and other people followed him in calling you with Yewedianesh and Yewedia sew.

(*Yewedianesh*, 1978: 211-212)

By using flash back technique, that is by returning backwards in the mid of the on going story, the author of *Yewedianesh* told us, how old *Yewedianesh* was and that her father was deceased, and other things such as her naming. All this was her childhood story narrated by *Yewedianesh* herself.

The following quotation represents another instance in which this same technique is reflected in Oromay.

... ኮሎኔል በትሩ ለመጀመሪያ ጊዜ በራሱ ሁኔታ ተገረመ ... በሕይወቱ ሌላ ሥራ ይዞ አያውቅም። በ1949 ከዩኒቨርሲቲ ኮሌጅ በፖለቲካል ሳይንስ በዲግሪ ተመርቆ እንደወጣ የተቀጠረው በፀጥታ ጥበቃ መሥሪያ ቤት ውስጥ ነበር ... ሀሳቡ ሃያ አምስት ዘመን ወደኋላ አቋርጦ ጋለበ። ... የሆነ ባዶነት ተሰማው ... አላገባም ልጅ አልወለደም ... ከእንግዲህ ምን ሊቀረው? ጡረታ? ... የኮበለለው ዕድሜው አናደደው።

(*አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 108*)

... Colonel Betru was astonished for the first time about the condition he found himself. ... He didn't have any other job. When he graduated in political science from Addis Ababa

University College, in 1949 E.C., he joined the Security Department. ... He recollect all his past 25 years experiences ... and found them empty. He did not even marry. He didn't have a child. ... His time had almost gone. With what he left with? with pension? His lost time annoyed him.

(Oromay, 1975: 108)

In the aforementioned quotation, it's through the flash back narrative technique, that we could learn some parts of the past history of Colonel Betru. He was a political science scholar who graduated from Addis Ababa University College. After working for twenty-five years in the security, he felt a sense of emptiness. He didn't marry, and had no child after all these years. He was just the same as the previous years. His style had not at all changed. As shown the history of Colonel Betru described in terms of flash back narrative technique helps readers to relate the past with Colonel Betru's present life, and make them give their overall evaluation of him.

Again, here is another example regarding the flashback narrative technique:

የቴሌቪዥን ድርጅት ጊዜያዊ ሠራተኛ ሆኜ ያላለፍኳቸው ወራት ... የሚዘነጉኝ አይደለም። በመጀመሪያ የተሰጠኝ የቅጥር ደብዳቤ 'የዋናው ሹም ፀሐፊ ልዩ ረዳትና የቴሌቪዥን አስተዋዋቂ' የሚል በመሆኑ ሠራው በጣም ቀሉኝ ነበር ... [ነገር ግን] በማላውቀው የሙያ መስክ ብስለት የሚጠይቁ ሠራዎች ይሰጡኝ ጀመር። በወዳጆቼና በራሴ ጥረት ልወጣው ሞክርኩ።

(እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1978፣ 211-212)

My memories of the contract work I had done for months at the TV Enterprise ... were still fresh. Firstly, the employment letter I received stated that I was a TV Programme announcer and a special assistant and the secretary of the Enterprise manager, both of which I found to be very easy. ... However, without any qualification in the profession, I was given more serious assignments demanding higher maturity and excellence, though I tried to manage them with hard work and assistance from friends.

(Enbutte Tsigerida, 1982: 199)

In the above quotation, Mestawat, narrator of Enbuttee Tsigerida, tells us how she started to work in the TV enterprise and also what job responsibilities she had, and the general work atmosphere she had in the TV Enterprise.

Now, to generalize the issue of the flash back narrative technique, let me quote what Holman stated in A Hand Book To Literature about it: “A flash back [technique] is a device by which a work presents material that occurred prior to the opening scene of the work. Various methods may be used, among them are: recollections of characters, narration by the characters, dream sequences, and reveries.” (Holman, 1992: 197).

Apart from flash back, there is also another narrative technique, known by the literary term foreshadowing. Foreshadowing points out or indicates something which will happen in the life of characters in the process of the story. It presents the characters future. In general, “the purpose of this technique is to prepare the reader or viewer for an action to come” (Ibid, 201). In fact, it makes readers ready for the events and deeds that will happen in the future of a certain story. In “a literary work, foreshadowing provides a hint of what is to occur later...” (Shaw, 1972: 165) usually resulting from “the establishment of a mood or atmosphere” (Ibid, 2010).

Let us now examine this technique with the help of instances taken from the novels under focus:

“... ደስታም ሆነ ሰላም የለኝም። ልቤ ዝም ብሎ ያዝናል።
እንዳንደ አልቅሺ አልቅሺ ይለኛል። ድሮ እኮ እንዲህ
አልነበርኩም። ... ግን ምን ነካኝ?” አሰቲ ንገረኝ አለችኝ።
(አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 258)

“... I have no peace, and joy. I feel sad at heart. Sometimes, I want to cry. In the past, I didn't feel like this ... but now what has happened to me? Tell me, please,” she said.

(Oromay, 1975: 258)

This quotation is what Fiammetta said to Tsegaye Hailemariam. She told him that she felt very sad and had no joy. Even sometimes, she was in the mood of crying. This was not what she used to feel in the past, but these days this has become her daily experience. Since this unfamiliar situation put her in a dilemma, she asked Tsegaye “What has happened to me?”

The whole situation of Fiammetta implied that she would come across something bad and undesirable in her life. Certainly, her not having “peace” and “joy” and her mood of wanting to “cry” are also indicators. In fact, these indications constitute a foreshadowing for the action or happenings, which will occur in Fiammetta’s future life; actually death.

The following is another example of foreshadowing taken from the novel, Yewedianesh:

የዕለቷ ፀሐይ የምዕራቡን አድማስ ነክታለች። አካባቢያችን በጨለማ መጋረጃ ሊጋረድ ጥቂት ደቂቃዎች ብቻ ቀርተዋል። አትክልቱ ውስጥ በመዘዋወር ላይ እንዳለሁ [ቀኔ] ... ለዓይን ያዘ። ... የምሽት ከዋክብት ብቅ ብቅ ማለት ጀመሩ። ... ከወደ ሰሜን ... ቀዝቃዛ ንፋስ ይነፍሳል። የዛፎቹ ቅርንጫፎች እርስ በርሳቸው እየተሻሻሹ የትርምስ ልፊያ ይዘዋል። ... ዛፎች በጨለማ ጥልቅ ውቅያኖስ ተውጠው ይወዛወዛሉ።

(የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 54)

There were only very few minutes left for the curtain of darkness to cover the surroundings. As I was walking in the garden ... it actually became dark... The stars began to appear ... and a very cold wind was blowing from the northern ... direction. As a result, the branches with their trees were heavily moving to-and-fro ... in the ocean of darkness.

(Yewedianesh, 1978: 54)

The narrator tells us that the sun was setting in the west. Darkness was going to replace the day. Besides, a cold wind was blowing from the northern direction and moving the branches of the trees. Thus, the whole atmosphere was not

stable and quiet. Such description of the setting constitutes a foreshadowing of the things which will happen in the life of characters in the story mentioned. In addition to this the dark time which took the place of the day also indicated the bad fortune that would occur in the life of Yewedianesh. As the narrator said: “little time was left” for Yewedianesh to meet the bad fortune.

It was in that unpleasant and messy situation that Getaneh and Yewedianesh began their love and friendship. The bad fortune was also getting nearer. Then, a year later, Yewedianesh became pregnant. Because of this, Getaneh’s mother sent her out of their house. Then, Yewedianesh was left without shelter. So, bad life and its hard and darkened hand gripped her. When she gave birth to a child, she lost him on the street by committing a crime. Because of this crime, she was caught by police and, after investigation, she was sentenced to six years imprisonment. This shows that the foreshadowing was actualized in Yewedianesh’s life.

Since writers purposely use this technique in their novels, readers can easily trace it. The following quotation is another instance of foreshadowing taken from Enbutte Tsigerida:

ናዝራት ሰንደርስ መሸቷል “... ምን ይሻላል? በጨለማ ረጅም ጉዞ ጥሩ ስለማይሆን እናንተ አልቤርጎ ያዙና እዚሁ እደሩ እኔ እየበረርኩ ዛሬውኔ ዩዲትን ማግኘት አለብኝ” አሉ አዛውንቱ።
 “እንደ! ጋሼ የናዝራት ወመኔ ይዘረፈን ብለው ነው?” ብላ ማርታ ከሰውቶው ጋር እንድንመለስ ትማጠን ጀመር። እኔም አካባቢው አሰፈራኝ።

(እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 290)

When we reached Nazeret, it was almost dark. Then the old driver said: “... A long journey at night is not so good. What can we do now? You two should hire a bed here; and I will now return [to Addis Ababa] to meet Yodit” “Oh! How can you leave us alone here for Nazareth robbers?” said Martha and asked the old man to take us with him. The place was also frightening to me.

(Enbutte Tsigerida, 1982: 290)

Mestawat and Martha, the two friends, were in Nazareth to look for their friend, Yodit. The old man was Yodit's relative who gave them a lift from Debre Zeit town to Nazareth. However, the time was too late and dark when they reached Nazareth town. Besides, Yodit had returned from Nazareth to Addis Ababa. When they got this information, Yodit's relative (the old man) decided to return to Addis leaving the two girls alone in Nazareth town. The reason he gave for leaving them there, was that it was late and dark, and it was not advisable to drive at night. However, Martha told the old man not to leave them alone there. Being frightened by the general environment they found themselves in, she said: "The place is frightening to me". Then, having understood the girls' idea, the driver agreed to take them with him. Nevertheless, while they were on the way to Addis Ababa, two men came with their cars and pointed a pistol at the old man and ordered him to drive slowly towards Addis Ababa. The reason they gave for doing such a thing was that, the old man had hit a person with his car at the Koka juncture while driving from Addis Ababa to Nazareth, although their motive for doing such a thing was not this.

It was a tactical move for taking the two girls to the place where they could abduct one of them. So, when they got to the place they arranged for, Gedlu Lemma abducted Mestawat and raped her for the second time. This is thus a foreshadow in which Mestawat's fear of Nazareth came to be realized. In fact, the dark was in Nazareth, and Mestawat's fear of the place, are foreshadows for the abduction of Mestawat and also for the later bad experiences she faced in her life.

4.5.3 Epistolary and Telephone Method

In the novels in focus letters and telephone are used for communication in the presentation of the stories. Therefore, now I shall examine and deal with these techniques in turn. Let us begin with the epistolary method.

Epistolary as a narrative method according to Holman (1980: 165) is: "... [A method where] a narrative is carried forward by letters written by one or more characters". This technique has been exhibited in some parts of Enbutte Tsigerida and Oromay. For example, in Enbutte Tsigerida letters which Mestawat and her father Teshale exchanged, the letter written by FAMICO to Mestawat; and in Oromay, the letter written by Fiammetta to Tsegaye Hailemariam can be cited as examples.

So, the narration in Enbutte Tsigerida from pages 126-131, 142-150, 234-236 and 280-287 are moved forward with letters. The first letter has been written by Mestawat to her father, Teshale. She summarized and presented it as follows:

በፋሲካ ሰሞን ለተሻለ ደብዳቤ ጻፍኩለት “ሥራው ተሰማማህ?
እኔ ልጅህም ትምህርቴን በደንብ እየተከታተልኩኝ ነው። አይዞህ
ተሻለ ለእኔ አታሰብ! ምንጊዜም አንተን የማኮራህ አንድ ልጅህ
ነኝ...” የሚል ነበር የደብዳቤዬ ሀሳብ።

(እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 126)

I wrote a letter to Teshale in Easter. The contents of my letter were these: “Are you all right with your job? Teshale, don’t worry so much about me. I am carefully and properly pursuing my education. You should feel confident and be proud of me, your daughter...”

(Enbutte Tsigerida, 1982: 126)

When Teshale received Mestawat’s letter, he answered her in a short letter as follows:

የጻፍሽልኝ ደብዳቤ ሲደርሰኝ ... አንቺን ውድ ልጄን በአካል
ያገኘሁሽ መስሉኝ ፖስታውን ሳምኩኝ። በአንደኛው ተርም
ፈተና ጥሩ ውጤት ማግኘትሽን ከደብዳቤሽ ስረዳ ደስታዬ እጥፍ
ድርብ ሆነ ከጅምሩ እንዲህ ከሆንሽ ኮሌጅ ገብተሽ ለመመረቅ
ምንም እንደማያግድሽ ውጤትሽ ፍንጭ ሊሆን ይችላል እላልሁ
... መስቲ የኔ ተስፋ! ራስሽን ጠብቂ! ትምህርትሽ ላይ ብቻ
በርቺ! በሰላም ይግጠሙን።

ናፋቂው አባትሽ
ሐረር ከተማ

(እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 126-131)

When I received your letter, I kissed the envelop ... as if I physically met you. When I came to know from your letter that you got a good result in your first term examination, I was very much pleased. The fact that you scored a very high result at the beginning meant that nothing would hinder you from joining and graduating from college. He further said: "Mesti, my hope! Take care for yourself! persevere in your studies. Peace be with you."

Your Father Teshale Tibebu

Harar, City

(Enbutte Tsigerida, 1982: 126-131)

Teshale, in his first letter to his daughter Mestawat, raised so many things and advised her. He wrote about his job and the general condition he was in. He advised her about her future life, especially, her connection with men. So, with the help of the letter exchange method, some parts of the story of Enbutte Tsigerida is presented. Letters of characters are used for narrating the story in Enbutte Tsigerida.

This technique of narration is also used in Oromay as well. In this novel, more than ten pages of the story (from page 350-361) are presented in an epistolary method.

Fiammetta's letter which was written to Tsegaye Hailemariam narrates some parts of the story in Oromay. Fiammetta wrote it when Tsegaye was at the war front. In her letter she discussed their love, Shabia's interest in him, and the way he should keep himself from their attacks.

Let us observe an extract of Fiammetta's letter:

ፀጋዬ ይህ የመጨረሻ ቃሌ ነው። የተገናኘንበትን ቀን እረግመዋለሁ ... እኔ የተፈጠርኩት ለደስታ ነው ብዬህ የለም ... አሁን ግን ደስታ የለኝም። ደስታን አጥቼዋለሁ። ሕይወት ሥቃይ ሆናብኛለኝ። ... ከጥቂት ሳምንታት በፊት አንድ ሰው ቤቴ መጥቶ ከፀጋዬ ኃይለማርያም ወይም ካንቺ ሕይወት እንዲያን ምረጫ አለኝ። ሰውዬው የሚፈልገው ነገር ግልፅ ነበር። እንተን ከተፈለገበት ቦታ በተወሰነ ሰዓት ይገዛ እንደመጣ ነበር ... እንዲያው ሆኖ ጊዜውንና ቦታውን ሳይነግሩኝ አንተ

ተነስተህ ወደ ጦር ግንባር ሔድክ ... በየጊዜው ቤቴና ቢሮዬ
 እየደወሉ ... ሰላም [ነሱኝ] ይህን ሳልነግርህ ብሞት አንተም
 አትተርፍም ነበር። የነበረኝ አማራጭ ይህን ደብዳቤ ፅፌ ...
 መላክ ነበር ... ይደርስሃል ብዬ ተስፋ አደርጋለሁ ... ችው
 ፀጋዬ።

(አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 350-361)

Tsegaye, this is my last word to you. I curse the day in which we were introduced to each other... Didn't I tell you that I was interested to lead a joyful life? ... But at this time I have no joy. My life has been full of suffering. A few weeks ago a certain man came to my residence and said: "Choose between your life and that of Tsegaye Hailemariam's." Of course, the man's desire and interest was clear to me. That was to hand you over to them [Shabia], at the place they would be waiting for. Fortunately, however, before they told me the time and place for handing you over to them, you went to the war front. They phoned several times to my home and office, they pestered me and disturbed my peace. [So] if I died before I informed you all these things, you would not be safe either [from their attack]. [Therefore], the only option I had was to write and send you this letter. I hope this letter would reach you! ... Tsegaye! ... Good bye!

(Oromay, 197: 30-361)

Fiammetta's letter sent to Tsegaye Hailemariam is the text presented above. In this letter, she informed him of many issues and secrets she withheld earlier. Along with these, she also indirectly described and informed readers about pieces of information they had no knowledge of. This is how the epistolary narrative technique is used.

In addition to the epistolary narrative technique used in Oromay, the telephone communication method of presenting a story is also seen in it. In fact, this is the only novel in which this technique is identified. We cannot trace it in the other novels which are considered in this study.

Here is an instance of a telephone dialogue between Roman Heletework and Tsegaye Hailemariam. Roman was calling Tsegaye from Addis Ababa and Tsegaye's secretary said:

“ንድ ፀጋዬ ቴሌፎን ካዲሳባ”
 እየተነጫነጭኩ ቴሌፎኑን ተቀበልኩና
 “ማንልበል?” አልኩ
 “ምነው ተቆጣህ? አለችኝ ሮማን ገለተወርቅ ካዲስ አበባ”
 “አ! ሮሚዬ ደህና ነሽ ተቆጣሁ እንደ?”
 “እንደ መብረቅ አንባረቅህብኝ እንጂ ...”
 “ምንላድርግ አባክሽ? አልቆጥኛል ካዲሳባ ... እየደወሉ
 ይጨቀጭቀኛል። ... ደህና ነሽ?” አልኩት
 “ምነው እንዲህ ጠፋህ ልጄ?”
 “አለሁ። ... አዲሳባችን እንደት ናት?”
 “ጭር ብላለች...”
 “ናፍቆሻለሁ...”
 “እንድ የቴፕ ክር ልኬልህለሁ...”
 “የምን ክር?...”
 “የዘፈን ናፍቆቴን የሚገልፅ ...”
 “አኬ አመሰግናለሁ። እንደደረሰኝ አዳምጠዋለሁ ከዚህ
 “የምትፈልገው ነገር ካለ እልክልሻለሁ”
 “ምንም አልፈልግም ... ይኼ ከተማ ለውጠኝ ደርሷል ቶሎ
 ናልኝ”
 “እሺ ሮሚዬ።”

(አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 151-154)

“Comrade Tsegaye! Telephone call from Addis Ababa.”
 “I took up the telephone handle and then, with a high tone and angry voice, I said: “Hello! Who is that?”
 “Roman Heletework from Addis, “Why are you angry?” she said.”
 “Oh! Romi! How are you? Did I shout at you?”
 “Yes, you exploded like a thunder.”
 “What shall I do? My bosses from Addis Ababa are calling and nagging me. [Anyway] how are you then?” I said to her.
 “You did not call me [for a long time]. What happened to you?”
 “Nothing [at all]. I am fine. How is Addis?”
 “It seems lifeless and dead as a door nail”
 “I am fond of you...”
 “Me too... I sent you a tape...”
 “What tape?”
 “A love song”
 “Okay! Thank you. I will listen to it as soon as I receive it. [Now], what can I send you from here?”

"I don't want anything. But this city has become painful to me. So, please come soon"
"Okay Romil!"

(Oromay, 1975: 151-154)

Here is another telephone call from Tsegaye Hailemariam in Asmara to Fiammetta. This telephone dialogue goes from page 155-152:

... ቴሌፎን አንሰኛ ወደፊያሜታ ጊላይ ደወልኩ
"ሄ ሉ? አለኝ ...
"ጸጋዬ ኃይለማርያም ዝብሐል ትዝክርንዶ?"
"ደህና ነህ? ምነው ጠፋህ?..." አለኝ
"ሥዕላይ በራሺ እንደት ነው?" አልኳት
"አልሰማህም እንደ?... የፊታችን እሁድ ልንጋባ ነው..."
"... ለሠርጋችሁ አትርሱኝ..."
"እሺ! አሥመራ እንደት ይዞህል?" ብላ ጠየቀችኝ
"... በውበቷ ገና መደሰት አልጀመርኩም..."
"ምፅዋ ትሔዳለህ?"
"አዎ"
"ለምን እዚያ አንገናኝም?"
"እውነት?"
"... ለመሄድ አስቤያለሁ ጉርጉሱም ላይ ፈልገኝ ..." [አለኝ]

(ኢሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 155-157)

"I picked up the telephone handle and phoned to Fiammeta"
"Hel-lo?" she said.
"... I am Tsegaye Hailemariam. Do you remember me?"
"[Oh!] How do you do? Where have you been these days? ..." she said.
"How is Siely Berahi?" I said.
"... Didn't you hear about him? Next Sunday we shall be engaged in marriage."
Do not forget to call me on that occasion."
"Okay!... How is Asmara to you? She asked.
"... I did not yet start to enjoy its beauty."
"Would you go to Mitsiwa?..."
"Yes!"
"[Then], why don't we meet there?..."
"Are you sure to come?..."
"I am planning to go there. So, look for me at Gurgusum..." [she said]

(Oromay, 1975: 155-157)

Apart from the above instances, there are other telephone calls which assisted the narration of Oromay. Thus, the call between Tsegaye and Colonel Betru about the issue of jamming Shabia's Radio broadcast (pages 245-247), and the call between Tsegaye and the responsible person in the Voice of Ethiopian Radio Station (pages 247-248), Tsegay's call to Fiammetta (pages 284-285) for saying good bye to her when leaving for the war front. Also when he returned, the call he made to Colonel Betru (p.34) and to Fiammetta Gilaie (pages 341-342) are some of the examples.

In general, Oromay has widely and purposfully used the telephone as a narrative technique. Thus, telephone calls from Addis Ababa to Asmara, or from Asmara to Addis Ababa, and from one direction of Asmara to the other are some of the examples mentioned. These calls enabled to make contact between characters as well as to narrate the story.

So, the narrative techniques which are presented and examined here are the techniques which can be traced in the novels. The authors have used them duly and extensively in these works.

All in all, we have discussed the most essential narrative techniques which are observed in the novels under study. And now I shall pass on to the next chapter, and deal in turn with the narrators of the novels, and comparing the authors' narrative techniques they used in presenting their stories in first person point of view.

CHAPTER FIVE

NARRATORS

Inanu Agonafer, Mestawat Teshale, Getaneh Yeayeheyera, and Tsegay Hailemariam are the narrators of the four novels, namely, Settegñña Adari, Enbutte Tsigerida, Yewedianesh and Oromay, respectively.

So, as it has already been discussed in the previous sections of this work, particularly in chapter two, narrators are considered to be the 'voice' of a narrative. They serve as mediators between the fictional world deeds, events, and the real world readers. Hence, they are taken as a bridge to connect two points which exist in two different places. Therefore, they are the main ingredients of a fiction.

5.1 Inanu Agonafer

The narrator of Settegñña Adari is a woman called Inanu Agonafer. As it can be observed from the title page of the novel, and its introduction, Inanu is the author. Hence, she is both the narrator as well as the writer of the novel. Moreover, the story is an autobiography of Inanu, who is the main character in the story. Thus she is a homodiegetic narrator, a narrator who participates in the story he/she tells.

The name "Inanu Agonafer" is not her real name, but a pen name. In the preface of the novel, she puts the reason why she has written her 'autobiography' using a pen name. Along with this she introduces herself by mentioning her profession and educational level. Let us have a glimpse of this in the following quotation:

... መታዘብ ሴተኛ አዳሪነት ነው ... የሚሰማኝን ስሜትና በአእምሮቱ ውስጥ የሚገኘውን ነገር በወረቀት ላይ ለማስፈር ያህል አማርኛ ተምራድያለሁ። ... ይህን አነስተኛ መጽሐፍ የእኔ የእናኑ አጎናፍር አጭር የሕይወት ታሪክ ናት። እናኑ አጎናፍር የተባለው ... ስም የብዕር ስሜ ነው። መጠሪያ ስሜን ገልጮ ያልጻፍኩበት በቂ ምክንያት አለኝ። እንደኛ የኔ የሕይወት ታሪክ በሙያ ከሚመሰሉኝ ሴቶች የተልዩ ሰላልሆነ የሁላችንም የሕይወት ታሪክ እንዲሆን በወል ስም ለማበርከት... ሁለተኛ ... የሕይወት ታሪኬን አበርክቼ መጠሪያ ስሜን ለመተው ስለፈለግሁ ነው

(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 5-6)

... My profession is prostitution, ... I learned Amharic simply to write and express my feelings. ... This small book is the autobiography of myself, Inanu Agonafir, ... which is my pen name. I have my own basic reason for not exposing my actual name. Firstly, since my life history was not different from those women who were in the same profession as me, I thought of presenting a common life history of all of us in the same boat with a common name. ... Secondly, ... I wanted to give my life history as a present without mentioning my real name.

(Settegñña Adari, 1956: 5-6)

As presented in this introduction, Inanu is a prostitute by profession and the story she tells is her autobiography presented in her pen name. Regarding her educational level she states that she only has the knowledge of the Amharic language, which enabled her to write her autobiography. Because of this, Inanu can be considered as a “semi-illiterate” woman, who has no deep knowledge of the world. But on the other side she is an “author” of novel - Settegñña Adari's. She recognized that she is the writer in the preface and in her acknowledgement to the assistance of the people who helped her in editing, publishing etc. Thus, she says: “... ጽሑፉን ላረመልኝ መጽሐፉን ለማሳተም ላበቁኝና እንዲሁም ሥዕሎቼን ለነደፉልኝ ሰዐሊ ከልብ የሆነ ምሥጋናዬን አቀርባለሁ” (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 6) “... I would like to give my heart-felt gratitude to those people who assisted me in editing, publishing and drawing pictures in my book” (Settegñña Adari, 1956: 6).

Consequently, Inanu is a three dimensional character: she is an author, a main character, the narrator of the novel. The story she narrates (as shown in the preface) is her autobiography, which mainly focuses on the prostitution business. According to her statement, the book (Settegñña Adari) is a product of her long time experience in the business.

After Inanu has introduced to readers her business, educational level and the purpose of her writing she also indirectly tells about her physical appearance with the comments of certain characters, and she says: “... መልክሽ ውብ ነው። ቆዳሽ ግን የዋህ ይመስላል” (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 10) “You seem to be a naïve woman, but your physical appearance is attractive” (Settegñña Adari, 1956: 10). This comment was given by a man who lived with her for two and a half years.

Besides, Inanu directly tells the readers about her physical appearance. This is how she says it:

ከንደኞቼ እንደሰማሁት ... መልኩ ስልክክ ያለ አይደለም ... ቆመቴ ዘለግ ያለ ነው። ... ጠጉራ ልስልስ ሆኖ ሐር የመሰለ ጥቁር ነው ... ዐይኖቼ ጎላ ጎላ ብለው ክብ ከሆነው ፊቴ መካከል ... ጉብ ብለዋል። ... ጥርሶቼ ... በውሃ ዳር የተከለከሉ ነጭ አሞሮች ይመስላሉ።

(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 33-34)

According to the comments of my friends, ... the physical appearance of my face is not so much pretty. ... I am tall. ... My hair is as soft as black silk. My beautiful eyes are ... situated in the centre of my round face. My teeth ... are like white pigeons who stand in a row around the water.

(Settegñña Adari, 1956: 33-34)

As a narrator, Inanu introduces herself to the readers before she begins to tell the story. This is because, according to Romberg (1962: 84), “a narrator is expected to begin a story presenting himself, by sketching his early life and his social and genealogical background”. Similarly, Inanu has described her social background.

She is physically characterized and presented with a full human identity. As a result, readers recognise her as a human being and accept her life experience as a human being as well. That is why Inanu introduces her self, before presenting the story.

However, at the very beginning of the story, Inanu seems confused, and lacks a sense of certainty in presenting her own history. This is because, she considers it as an unnecessary and nonsensical issue. This is how, she says it: “የልጅነት ታሪክ ለአንባቢ የሚሰጠው ምንም አስደናቂ ነገር የያዘ አይመስለኝም። የአሁኑም የሕይወት ታሪክ ቢሆን በክብርና በዝና ላይ የተመሰርተ አስደናቂ ወግ አይደለም ...”(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 8) “I don’t think the story of my childhood contains something wonderful to be presented to readers. Even the life I lead these days is not a wonderful story based on big fame, and honour” (Settegñña Adari, 1956: 8). The above quotation shows that, eventhough Inanu was ready to tell the story, she had no full confidence in the importance of the story she was going to present. Hence, she declares that nothing new and important could come out of the story. At the beginning, Inanu seems to be in a dilemma for telling her own life history. But later she abruptly changes her mind and begins to tell the story of her childhood. She says: “ወደ ልጅነቴ ታሪክ ልመለስና የትውልድ አገሬ ጎጃም ያደግሁት ደሴ ሲሆን ... የተዳርሁት ... በ12 ዓመቴ ነው ... ” (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 8) “Let me go back to tell the story of my childhood. I was born in Gojam and brought up in Dessie ... At the age of twelve I married...” (Settegñña Adari, 1956: 8). Hence, Inanu continued to tell the story though she felt it was useless at the beginning.

What we recognize from this is that Inanu is an inconsistent narrator, who has no firm stand in the position she is in. In this regard Hawthorn says: “an inconsistent narrator, cannot, logically, be wholly reliable” (1992: 67). In fact, if the narrator’s stand is not clear and not logical, it could be unreliable. And some times they could be unreliable because: “... they may intentionally or

unintentionally mispresent events and misdirect readers” (Kirszner and Mandell, 1991: 176).

In this regard, we shall raise some instances from Settegñña Adari, and examine the unreliability of Inanu. For example, when Inanu tells about her first experience of Woube Berha Night Club and the customers she comes across, she says: “በአምስት ቀን ምሽት [ውሰጥ] የተመለከትኳቸው ሰዎች ባህርያቸው እንደመልካቸው የተለያዩ ነበር” (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 5-6)(መስመር የተጨመረ) “The people whom I have met in the last five days differ in their manner just like their physical appearance” (Settegñña Adari, 1956: 29) (underlying mine). In her five days experience of Woube Berha Night Club, she observed different customers who have different manners. The important issue here is not Inanu’s experience or the people of Woube Berha but the important thing is the “five days” Inanu passed in the Night Club. What she has given us as “five days” in the above quotation has soon been changed to “two days” when she states: “የሁለት ቀን ምሽት ብዙ ጉድ ካሳየኝ በኋላ የሥራ ጓደኞቼ በሁለት ነገር አስቀኑኝ” (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 29)(መስመር ተረጨመረ) “The last two nights enabled me to observe many things [in the Night Club]. Later I was envious of my work mates for two main things” (Settegñña Adari, 1956: 29) (underlying mine).

Of course, the above quotation and the previous one are stated on the same page of Settegñña Adari, though, the idea which Inanu presented regarding the days she passed in the Woube Berha Night Club totally different. First she says “five days”, and then she says “two days”. So, thus kind of presenting a story creates confusion in the readers’ mind and also makes the narrator unreliable.

Again let us consider the following two quotations: A and B:

- ሀ. በተፈጥሮዬ ... እነጋገሩ የተመዘነ ቀልዱ የሚጥም ወንድ ደስ ይለኛል። ... በገበያ በኩል የሚያጋጥሙኝን ወንዶች ... አመርጣለሁ ማለቱ አይደለም ...
(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 59) (መሰመር የተጨመረ)
- A. *As for me, a man who is not talkative and whose joke is sensible and smart is my favourite man. However, I don't mean I make a choice between men when it come to business.*
(Settegñña Adari, 1956: 59) (underlying mine)
- ለ. “... ጤንነቱ አጠራጣሪ መሰሉ የሚታይ ሰው ሲያጋጥመኝ ምንም ቢሆን ከእርሱ ጋር አልተኛም”
(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 59) (መሰመር የተጨመረ)
- B. “... However, I will never sleep with a man whom I suspect is unhealthy”.
(Settegñña Adari, 1956: 59) (underlying mine)

In quotations “A” and “B”, the underlined sentences indicate Inanu’s contradictory idea. In quotation “A” Inanu declares that “She makes no choice between men”, and again in quotation “B”, she denied the first idea and said: “I will never sleep with a man ... who seems unhealthy”. Hence, Inanu lacks consistence in what she says. This makes readers suspect her and doubt the truth of what she presents. This puts her under the category of unreliable narrators.

Apart from being unreliable, she is also an innocent or naïve narrator. When Kirsznner and Mandell (1991: 177) write about unreliable and naïve narrators, they say:

Some narrators are unreliable simply because they are naïve. Because they are immature, sheltered, or innocent of evil, these narrators may not be aware of the full significance of the events they are relating.

Hence, having no experience of working in the Night Club and also being a new comer to the circumstance, her naivety has been reflected in most of her deeds and activities. For instance, once a certain man who was a guest of the Night Club invited her to take a drink. So when she gave the order to the waiters to

bring her “Whisky”, she made a mistake in giving the order. When she explained how she make a mistake, she said: “... ውስኪ በሶዳ እላለሁ ብዬ ... ውስኪ በጠጅ አልኩኝ አንድ ወር ሙሉ ተሳቀብኝ” “... I wanted to order (say) Whisky with Soda; however, I said Whisky with Teji. As a result, many of my friends mocked at me for a month” (Settegñña Adari, 1956: 26).

Inanu’s naivety is reflected in many of her statements. In fact, before Inanu joined Woube Berha Night Club, she had worked in Wezero Bayoushi’s Teji Bet, in Merkato. So, when she gave the order to the waiters to bring her Whisky with Soda, the word “Teji” came into her mind and said: “Whisky with Teji”. Again on another occasion when she faced a certain problem, her lack of experience and innocence were reflected as follows:

... በአሻሻጭነት የተቀጠርኩ ቀን መጀመሪያ ... ከመጠጥ ቤቱ የገባው ጎረምሳ ... ይቺ ደግሞ 'ከየት መጣች?' ብሎ ጎኔ ቂጥ አለ። 'እርሷ አዲስ ናት' ስትል ሶፊያ መለሰች... 'መጠጥ አምጪላት' ሲል ትዕዛዝ ሰጠ። ከሌሊቱ ስድስት ሰዓት ሲሆን ... ጎረምሳው 'በይ አሁን ሰዓት ደርሷል እንሂድ' [አለ] ... መጣሁ አልኩና ወደ ጓዳ ገባ ስል ሐና ተከትላኝ መጣች ... 'ሰውዬው ምንድን ነው የሚልሽ' ስትል ጠየቀችኝ ... እንሂድ ይለኛል ስል መለስኩላት 'እንዳትሳሳቺ ... የእኔ ወዳጅ ነው' አለችኝ... መጠጥ ሰጠጣበት ቆይቻለሁ አይጣላኝም? ስል አንድ ዘይ እንድትነግረኝ ጠየቅኳት ' ... ወደ ማድቤት ሄደሽ መደበኛ ነዋ' ስትለኝ ተደበኝሁ። ... ጎረምሳው ቤቱን ሁሉ አተራምሶ በፖሊስ ኃይል ተጎትቶ ወጣ

(ሴተኛ አዳሪ: 1956: 27-28)

... On the first day I began to work as a waitress in the Night Club, the youngster who came into the bar ... said: “Where did this woman come from?” and then sat by my side. “She is a new comer,” Sofia answered. ... He then ordered Sofia to bring me a drink. Just at mid-might, ... the youngster said to me: “Now it’s time; let’s go.” ... I said: “I am coming,” and went to the next room in the bar. Hanna followed and came behind me and asked: “What did the young man say to you?” ... I replied that he wanted me to go with him. ... Then she said: “Becareful not to make a mistake; he is my friend.” ... I replied: “He invited me a drink. Will he not quarrel with me?” ... Then I asked Hanna to

find a way of getting rid of him. "Go to the kitchen and hide," Hanna said. Then I accepted her idea and hid there. ... Finally, the youngster disturbed the whole bar and then was dragged out by the police to make him leave.

(Settegñña Adari, 1956: 27-28)

On her first day experience of the Night Club business, Inanu faced a problem. Of course, as a prostitute and as far as Inanu was engaged in the business, she had the right to be with a man who would like to be with her and make love with. In fact, in such kind of business, other women had no right to stop her from doing so. However, as Inanu was a new comer and lacked experience in the prostitution business, she was mocked at by Hanna. Thus, she did not confront Hanna, but naively accepted her advise and hid in the kitchen. When the young man departed, she lost the benefit she could get from him. Moreover, she became the cause for the disturbance that was created in the Night Club.

Again in the following quotation we also observe Inanu's naivety.

ወደ ትምህርት ቤት በምሄድበት ጊዜ በአለባበሴም ሆነ በአረማመዴ ተማሪ ለመምሰል የተቻለኝን ያህል መሞከራ አልቀረም ... [ለዚህ] ዋናው ምክንያቱ ... ሴተኛ አዳሪ በመሆኔ ... በሐሜተኞች ... ዘንድ የትምህርት ቤቱ ስም ይዋረድ ይሆን? ብዬ በመጠራጠር ነው ... ያም ሆነ ይህ የግቴ ቀለበት ባለባል መሆኔን ስለሚመሰክር በምምህራኔም ሆነ በተማሪዎች ፊት የተለየሁ ፍጡር መስዩ ባለመገመቴ ለትምህርቱ ትጋትን ጨመረልኝ።

(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 38)

When I was going to school, I attempted to imitate regular students in the way I dressed and walked on the streets. ... The main reason for this was ... that I expected that the school would be defamed by gossipers ... because of my being a prostitute. However, ... the fact that I was wearing a ring on my finger proved that I was married and that teachers as well as students would not suspect that I was a different creature, intensified the efforts I made for learning.

(Settegñña Adari, 1956: 38)

While Inanu, was working in Woube Berha Night Club, she joined school and attempted to imitate the dressing and walking styles of regular school girls. This was to conceal her profession and to show that she belonged to the school community, and along with it, protect the name of the school from gossipers' blackmail. It is here that Inanu's innocence is observed. This is because she thought that as a result of gossip a school would lose its reputation just because it takes a professional prostitute as a student. She was unaware that this was not true. She did not also recognize that no body would be concerned with her dressing and walking style from among the large number of students found in the school. So, her attempt to conceal her profession is a useless attempt and an indicator of her foolish thought and naivety. Besides, nobody would defame a school's reputation because it accepts people who are in the prostitution business like her. Therefore, Inanu's suspicion was a wrong one, which was drawn out of her innocent nature.

The other issue which exposes Inanu's naivety is associated with her wearing a ring. Inanu thought that wearing a ring is the evidence to show that a woman is married and has a husband. It is true that a married woman wears a ring on her finger. Nevertheless, any woman who wears a ring does not necessarily mean that she has a husband, because due to different reasons a real married woman may not wear a ring on her finger. The irony here is Inanu's attempt to fool the school community as well as the readers of the novel. Of course, readers will not be fooled, but would laugh at her since they would understand her naïve personality.

The other context which reflected Inanu's naivety was when she contracted a contagious venereal disease called gonorrhoea. When she narrates this event, she says: "... ከሰውቶው ጋር ባደርኩ በስምንተኛው ቀን ጨብጥ የሚባለው በሽታ

እንደያዘኝ ... ደረሰኩበት ... ወንዶች ኑሮዬን ችግራን ... እያወቁ እንድታመም ለምን ይፈልጋሉ?" (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 56-57) "Just after the eighth day of sleeping with a certain man I learned that I contracted the disease called gonorrhoea. Why do men want me to suffer with diseases as they know my problem and living condition?" (Settegñña Adari, 1956: 56-67). This quotation tells us that Inanu contracted a contagious venereal diseases. Of course, the place (business) where she earns her living is exposed to such kinds of diseases as she has to make love with so many men who are guests of Woube Berha Night Club. Therefore, her being attacked by venereal diseases is not such a miracle or a new phenomenon that should be talked about. However, being a naïve woman who has not recognized the situation she is in, we hear her asking foolish and irrelevant questions and wanting to gain men's sympathy. It was thus due to her innocence that she forwards this question though she does not get a positive response. Actually, the problem with which she must be concerned was the living condition she was in. Men come to the Night Club for their enjoyment. So, the problem of a certain prostitute is not their concern and worry.

So far we have seen Inanu's naivety with a sufficient number of instances. Hereafter, we pass on to seeing her other features.

As a first-person narrator, Inanu is expected to narrate events as one person sees, recognizes, understands, etc. However, sometimes she presents the story like a third-person omniscient narrator. She tells about the events, actions, phenomena, which are found beyond her reach, and knowledge. Now, let us observe some examples in this respect from the narration she presents: "ፖሊሶቹም የሰውዬውን አሟሟት ከጠየቁ በኋላ በጠጁ ውስጥ አንድ ዓይነት መርዝ ቢኖርበት ነው የሚል ጥርጣሬ ስላደረገቸው ... ምርመራ እስኪያልቅ ድረስ ጠጁ እንዳይሸጥ ጥብቅ ተፅዕኖ ሰጡ" (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 18) (መስመሮች የተጨመሩ) "After the police men assessed how the man died, they suspected that there could be poison in the Teji.

So, until their investigation was over, they gave an order not to sell; any Teji” (Settegñña Adari, 1956: 18) (underlining is mine).

This incident took place when Inanu was working in Merkato “Teji Bet”. A certain man who was physically very thin had once been a customer to the Teji Bet. One day while this man was drinking Teji, he fell down on the ground and died on the spot. Then, the police came and began to investigate the real cause for the death of the person.

What is important for our discussion is not the death of the man, but the words of Inanu. She said that: “The police men suspected poison in the Teji”. But, how could she know the police men’s thought and suspicion? They were not heard saying what Inanu said. Therefore, Inanu looks like an omniscient narrator who has access to reading the minds of characters. But she is a first-person narrator and lacks such kind of quality.

Again, let us examine this quotation: “...ጎረምሳው ቤቱን ሁሉ አተራምሶ ሂሳቡን ሳይከፍል በፖሊስ ተጎትቶ ወጣ” (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 28)” “... The youngster disturbed the Night Club and was obliged to leave the place by the police” (Settegñña Adari, 1956: 28). However, at that moment Inanu was hiding in the kitchen. How could she tell us the way the youngster left the Night Club? As she is a first-person narrator she has no ability to see beyond her vision and tell about the events or actions which take place in her absence. Therefore, what she tells readers look like her “expectation”. And, mere “expectation” may lead readers to doubt the truthfulness of the story, as well as the inability of Inanu to tell the story. Similarly, Inanu presents the following action which she did not observe while it was happening. She says:

ሰውዬው [መኪናውን አቁሞ] ዞር ከግለቱ ሁለት ሌቦች
 ሲበዘብዙት ተመለከትኩ ... ፖሊስ ባቅራቢያው ስላልነበረ
 መስኮቱን ዘግቼ ወደ አልጋዬ አዘገምኩ ሌቦቹ ያገኙትን
 አግርተው ከሄዱ በኋላ ሰውዬው መኪናውን አስነሰቶ ሲሄድ ሰ
 ግሁት። ምን ሰርቀውት ይሆን?
 (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 112-113)

As soon as the man [stopped his car] and moved [to one of Gedam Sefer's Groceries] away, I saw two thieves coming and searching his car. As there was no police around, I closed my windows and went to bed. After the thieves had taken the things they found in the car and went away, I heard the man starting his car and drive away. What had they [the thieves] stolen from him?

(*Settegñña Adari*, 1956: 112-113)

Inanu tells about a certain man who has come to Gedam Sefer. When the man stops his car and goes away immediately thieves come and search his car. Inanu looks at the thieves, standing by her window. The time is late mid night. After a while Inanu closes her window and goes to bed. However, while she is in her bed, she continues to narrate about the thieves actions, as well as about the owner of the car. She says: “The thieves took the things they found in the car” and: “I heard the man driving his car away”. However Inanu is behind the closed door, how could she see the thieves taking the things out of the car? And again, how she could heard the sound of a car and enable to say that it was the owner of the car who drove away? So, as a first-person narrator, Inanu is incapable of narrating the actions she has not observed in person, or has heard from others. This is an instance of Inanu’s narration of events which have taken place without her presence and perspective. From these instances we can see that Inanu presents the story as an omniscient narrator. So, in general we could say Inanu did not seem characterized as a typical first-person narrator, who is fully aware of his/her function.

Apart from not knowing her function, Inanu is also seen boasting while telling the story. The boasting character of Inanu has prevailed in her comments, views, etc. of actions and events which happen in the story she tells. For instance, when she tells us about her beauty, and of her being the first choice of men who come to the Night Club of Woube Berha, she says: “ፎርሜን ማለት ጡቴንና ደረቴን ዳሌዬንና ባቴን የሚያደንቁ ወንዶች ... በብዛት አጋጥመውኛል ... የሚፈልገኝ ወንድ ብዙ ስለሆነ እኔ እንደቀሩት ሴቶች በአፈ እንድደልል፣ እንድቀባጥር ምክንያት የለኝም” (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 33-34)” “I came across a large number of men who admire my body shape especially my breasts, chest, thighs, legs and hip. Since there were so many men who wanted to make love with me, I didn’t bother to lobby and publicize myself, like my colleagues” (Settegnña Adari, 1956: 33-34).

Inanu declares that she has a beautiful body structure admired by a number of men and as a result many men want to make love with her. Consequently she does not bother to behave like her colleagues in the Night Club. This is Inanu’s boasting of her beauty and personality as she gives a high value to herself. On the other hand, she is also seen boasting of her knowledge and the talent she has, while she learns in the class room. The following is the quotation she is heard saying:

... ስለማህበራዊ ኑሮ ጉዳይ በምንማርበት ጊዜ በተለይ የሴተኛ አዳሪና ልዩ ልዩ የወንጀል ሥራ ስለሚጠቀስ እኔ የማቀርበው ክርክር የአስተማሪውንና የተማሪዎቹን አድናቆት ያስገኛልኝ ጀመር። አንዳንድ ጊዜ ከሚገባው [በላይ] ችግሩን ለማስረዳት በመቻሌ "ይህ ሥራዎ ይሆናል" ብለው እንዳይጠረጥሩኝ እፈራ ነበር።

(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 38)

... While we were discussing social life in the classroom and certain cases (of crime and prostitution) emerged, the discussions and comments I forwarded brought me admiration from the teachers and students. Sometimes when I deeply discussed issues (of prostitution and its problem), I was very much afraid that

they would suspect me of talking from experience of the business I came from.

(*Settegnāna Adari*, 1956: 38)

In this quotation, Inanu tells readers that she was an admired student in the classroom. Her knowledge in discussing the social life of prostitution and crime cases, had got her teacher's and classmates' admirations. This makes readers understand that she is a self praising narrator and a boastful person.

Again let me add one more example which indicates Inanu's boasting character:

የእኔን እንግሊዘኛ ንቀው የእነርሱን የተሰባበረ አማርኛ የሚያሰ
ውኝ አንዳንድ የውጭ አገር ሰዎች ይሰለጁኛል ... ሆኖም
ብዙዎቹ ወደኛ የሚመጡ እንግዶች ወይም ቱሪስቶች ... እንደ
ሰላም ጓዶች በአማርኛ ለመነጋገር የሚጥሩ [ሰላልነበሩ] የእኔም
አስተርጓሚነት ዋጋ አጥቶ አያውቅም። እንዲያውም ሶፊያ
ያቃታትን የእንግሊዘኛ ዐረፍተ ነገር እኔ እተረገመው ጀመር።
በአስተርጓሚነት እጋበዛለሁ።

(*ሴተኛ አዳሪ*፣ 1956፣ 40)

I was tired of those foreigners ... who attempted to speak with me in their poor Amharic by ignoring my broken English. However, as many of the guests or tourists who came to the Night Club were not ... like those 'peace corps', who wanted to speak more in Amharic, my duty as an interpreter was not valueless. I ever started to interpret those English sentences which were difficult to Sofia. So, I was invited as an interpreter [in the Night Club].

(*Settegnāna Adari*, 1956: 40)

Inanu boasts of her English. She considers herself as a person who has a good knowledge of the English language. However, she is a grade six student and does not have any good ground as such to boast of.

Therefore, if first-person narrator in this way speak words of praise regarding their good personality, talent, goodness, heroic deeds and the like, readers of their novels may not have appetite or desire to accept them and the stories they tell.

In addition to being boastful, Inanu is also a narrator who tells more about the side issues rather than the main subject started and being dealt with. Thus, in Settegnāna Adari, the basic story is Inanu’s life history; however, most of the time the story Inanu narrates is about the prostitution business, the type of people who participate in it, and also about the customers of Woube Berha Night Club. Therefore, Inanu “tends to narrate outwardly”. For instance, between chapter four and ten, different types of issue which are not related directly to Inanu’s life history have been raised and discussed in detail. In chapter seven the story which presents the death of Inanu’s son begins and then after a while the whole situation is diverted to telling another story such as the Ethiopian children and their life conditions. Therefore, Inanu’s life history of Settegnāna Adari, is seen to be totally diverted from the main objective and put aside in some junctures.

Another feature is, Inanu’s use of the English language in her narration. In most parts of the novel this phenomenon is prevalent. The English language is scribed in Amharic letters in different places in the novel. Here are some examples:

“ሐው-አር-ዩ-ቱ-ደይ-ማይ-ባቭ”
 “How are you today my love”
 “ሐው-ኢዝ-ቢዝነሰ?”
 “How is business”
 “ባይ-ሚ-ኤ-ድሪንክ-ፕሊዝ?”
 “Buy me a drink please”
 “አይ-ፊል-ጉድ-ኤንዱ-ዋል”
 “I feel good and well”
 “አይ-አም-ካይት-ዋል”
 “I am quite well”

(ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 39)
 (Settegnāna Adari, 1956: 39)

Again while Inanu presents Settegnāna Adari’s story, some times, she is seen getting into a confusion, which distorts the story. For instance, when her objective is to describe the behaviour of her characters, she happens to be

describing their physical appearance. Let us see some examples: Here is the description of the physical appearance of characters when it should be the description of the characters' behaviour: "... የተመለከትኳቸው ሰዎች ባህሪያቸው እንደመልካቸው የተለያዩ ነበር። አንዱ ልጅ፣ አንዱ ሽማግሌ፣ አንዱ ቀጭን፣ አንድ ወፍራም፣ አንዱ ራሰ በራ... (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 29)" "The customers I observed were different in their behaviour (manner) as they varied in their physical appearance. They were for example youngsters, old men, thin, fat and bald... (Settegnāna Adari, 1956: 29).

According to Inanu's statement given above, one expects that she will describe the manner (behaviour) of those people (customers) whom she has observed in the Woube Berha Night Club. Nevertheless, she describes their physical appearance. Therefore, she has distorted the narration.

Another instance of distortion is seen in the following narration. "... ስሜ ... ተሸሽጎ መኖሩ የማይጠረጠር ነው ሆኖም ... ከዛሬ ጀምሮ ... ሌሎች በህሊና ሥዕል እንዲመለከቱኝ ስለሕይወት ታሪኬ ሳይሆን ስለራሴ እንድ ሁለት ቃል እንድናገር ይፈቀድልኝ" (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 33) "No doubt that my name had been so far concealed. However, hereafter in order for others to visualize me in their minds, I request you to let me say a few words not about my life history but about myself." (Settegnāna Adari, 1956: 33).

Inanu's distortion is evident in this quotation when she says: "let me tell you about my self" and "but not about my life history." I think Inanu feels that what she tells about herself and her life story are two different things. Then this confusion distorts the narration. The main story of Settegnāna Adari, is the autobiography of Inanu, and so it talks about Inanu's self. How then can her "life history" and the story of "her self" be different? They are not different, but

because of Inanu's distorted presentation, the readers will become confused and get in dilemma, and then raise questions like this.

Again another distortion and difficulty of understanding is seen in Inanu's following narration. The statement reads as: “ልጅ ከመውለድ ይልቅ የቴሌቪዥን ሥራ የሚወዱ ሴቶች [አሉ]” (ሴተኛ አዳሪ፣ 1956፣ 122) “[There are] women who like watching television rather than giving birth to a child” (Settegñña Adari, 1956: 122).

In the above quotation, the two incomparable phenomena are seen compared. How can “watching television programs” and “giving birth to a child” be compared? The difficulty of understanding this statement (narration) lies in this comparison. The comparison is illogical as well as irrational. The concept behind the given narration is not easy to comprehend. So, Inanu has left the reader in confusion.

Before concluding examination of the function of Settegñña Adari's narrator let me put some important points about her. Inanu has told her autobiography. So, she is a narrator as she claimed. Also she is an author of Settegñña Adari. Therefore, Inanu is a three dimensional character: an author, main character of the story, and a narrator.

Of course, in the presentation of the story of Settegñña Adari, first of all, Inanu introduces herself to readers, and then she begins to tell the story. So, while she functions as a mediator of the story some characteristics of her such as being a boaster, her naivety, unreliability etc. prevail. In general, Inanu, as a first-person narrator, exposes many weaknesses or defects in her narration. Now, we shall stop it here examining her function, and pass to examine the function of Enbutte Tsegerida's narrator – Mestawat Teshale.

5.2 Mestawat Teshale

Enbuttee Tsigerida's narrator, Mestawat Teshale presents a story which took place two years before. The story is Mestawat's biography, as she is the central character and the homodigetic narrator. When she begins to tell the story, she gives the setting where the story begins and ends. Along with it, however, she indirectly introduces herself to the reader, through reading a letter sent from sister Elizabeth, the admirer of Mestawat's physical beauty. Here is the letter:

መስተቱ! ለጥቂት ሳምንታት ብለይሽም ... ከሰሞኑ እመጣለሁ
... የዛሬው ሳይሆን የትናንት ውበትሽ ከፊቴ ድቅን እያለ
ያሳስበኛል። ... ለሰዐሊ ሞደል እንዳልሆንሽ ሁሉ ... በአየር
መንገድ መጽሄትና በደስታ መግለጫ ካርዶች ላይ ውበትሽ
እንዳልተደነቀ ... ዛሬ እንዲህ ኩርምትምት ትይ! ... ይህን
ደብዳቤ የጻፍኩልሽ መከራሽን ላስታውሰሽ ፈልጌ እንዳልሆነ
የልቤን ታውቂያለሽ ... አይዘሽ መስተቱ ትድኛለሽ ...
(እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፡ 46-47)

Mesti! Though, I departed from you for a few weeks, ... I will come back around this week. ... But, I worry when I remember your early days' physical appearance, and beauty. As you hadn't been ... a model to artists ... and your beauty hadn't been admired and appeared on the Air Line Megazines, as well as on congratulation cards, ... you are now found in a physically contracted state. ... However, I didn't write this letter to remind your bad memory (suffering) ... [Okay] Mesti! Don't worry you will recover.

(Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 46-47)

According to the letter of sister Elizabeth, the physical appearance and beauty of Mestawat is indirectly described to the reader. Elizabeth's letter states that Mestawat is a beautiful woman whose picture appeared on Magazines and congratulation cards. Also, she was a model for artists. However, when she is presenting her story, she is found in a contracted physical condition. This is because of the accident which happened to her. So, she has become a crippled woman who uses a wheel-chair.

Furthermore, Mestawat describes her educational status. She says: “አስራ ሁለተኛ ክፍል ኮከበ ጽባሕ ት/ቤት ገብቼ እንድማር ተደረገ ... በሰኔ ወር መጨረሻ ... [በተፈተንኩት ፈተና] ... በጥሩ ውጤት ማለፊን አወቅሁ ... ውጤቴን ከሰማሁበት ቀን አንስቶ አንድም ቀን ከቤቴ ሳልወጣ ... መጻሕፍት ሳነብ ክረምቱ ተገባደደ” (እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 161-167) “I happened to learn in grade twelve at Kekobe Tsibah School. ... At the end of last June, ... I learned that I passed the examination with good results. ... From the day I collected my examination results upto the end of the summer time, I stayed home reading books” (Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 161-167).

So, Mestawat was a grade twelve student. When she completed grade twelve, she joined a certain TV enterprize and became a TV journalist. There she gave service as a program announcer and producer for certain years. Then, she left the enterprize and joined an organization called FAMICO. In FAMICO she was an advertizer for the materials and equipment FAMICO produces. However, while she was working in this enterprise she was physically injured and was paralyzed because of a car accident. So, because of her physical disability, she left FAMICO. Thus, Mestawat, directly or indirectly introduced her physical appearance, educational level, and profession by telling her story. More than all others, however, she directly or indirectly raises and tells about her beauty, and physical appearance. Therefore, a boastful character is reflected by her as well. For instance, when her fathers introduced his friend Gedlu to her, she said:

... ገድሉን መጀመሪያ ያየሁት ተሻለ ቢሮ ሄጄ ... ነበር። ያኔ
 ... ገድሉ የተሻለን ቢሮ እንኳኑቶ ከገባ በኋላ ‘ተሻለ! የማነች
 ቆንጆ ልጅ? ዕፁብ ድንቅ ቁመና ሞናሊዛን አይደለም እንደ
 የምትመስለው?’ [አለ] ... ልጅ ነችኮ አለ በፈገግታ
 (እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 121)

... I saw Gedlu for the first time once when ... I was in Teshale’s office. On that occasion, when Gedlu entered and saw me in

Teshale's office he said: 'Oh! a beautiful girl! Whose is she, Teshale? Doesn't she look like Monaliza?' Teshale smiles and said: 'She is my daughter'.

(Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 121)

In this quotation, though Mestawat presents the comments of Gedlu, she actually tells about her beauty. She is proud of her physical appearance.

Here is another instance:

በቀንጅና ... ኤልሳ ፈቃደና ዩዲት ካሳ ጥሩ አቋም
ቢኖራቸውም ዐይነ አፋር በመሆኑ ይመስለኛል ወንዶች እኔን
ሲያደንቁ ይሰማል ... የግንፍሌ ወንዶች ያገቡትም ሆነ ...
ጎረቤቶቹ በተለይ በእኔ ዙሪያ ሲያንገኙበት ይውላሉ 'መስታወት
የሠፈራችን ቆንጆ' እያሉ ...

(እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 155)

Though Eliza Fekade and Yodit Kassa have a better [physical make up [and are beautiful], ... men are heard admiring me, I think because of my shyness. Men in the Genfele visinity, whether married or [unmarried], ... youngsters pay specially closer attention to me. They say: 'Mestawat is the most beautiful girl of our village'....

(Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 155)

Mestawat is heard saying that she is more beautiful girl than Eliza and Yodit. Though these two girls are found in a better physical condition and beauty, she says: “men admire her (Mestawat) more than them”. Moreover, she says: “In the Genfele visinity, both married or unmarried men are always looking after me, by saying: ‘Mestawat is the most beautiful girl of our visinity’”. This is of course a self praising statement, and this presentation leads us to say that Mestawat is a self praising and boastful narrator.

Mestawat's character of admiring her beauty is also reflected in statements with regard to her talent in education. Let us observe what she has narrated about her ability of doing an examination: “... አንድ ጊዜ እነ ማርታ ፈተና አግኝተው የሚሰ

ራላቸው ቢያጡ ወደ እኔ አመጡት ... ያመጡልኝን ፈተና በደንብ ሠራሁና እነርሱም መልሱን አጥንተው ተፈተኑ። ውጤት ላይ እኔ በለጥኳቸው” (እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982: 159) “... Once, Martha [and other friends of mine] stole an examination, paper, and then, since they could not work it out they brought it to me and I fully worked it out for them. Then, they studied the answers and took the exam. However, I was better than them in the result” (Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 159). As we observe in the above quotation, Mestawat is telling about her talent and her outstanding performance. She compares herself with her friends and put her work on the top. She is boasting of her ability and deeds. As shown most of her narration reflects that she is boastful.

So, if a first-person story teller is a self praising and boastful person, the story which is presented by such a narrator may not be wholly assimilated by readers because of the doubts they develop in the narrators. Thus, both the story and the narrator may lose credibility.

Furthermore, the narrator of Enbuttee Tsigerida is not only a boaster, or a self praising person, but also a narrator who sometimes tells a story by reading the minds of characters Mestawat tells the inner feelings, motives, etc. of the characters, just like an omniscient narrator. Let us examine some instances and observe how Mestawat narrates as an omniscient narrator. When she tells about the inner feeling of her mother, she says: “አታባ በረንዳው ሥር እንደተቀመጠች ... በእኔ ... ሁኔታ ውስጧ ሲነድ ይታየኛል ... የውስጥ ብሽቀቷን ለማፈን ... ስትሞክር አውቅባታለሁ ... ” (እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982: 42) “When Etabba was sitting under the verandah, I visualized that she was fermenting deeply upset because of my health condition. I could understand her attempts to cover up what she feels inside” (Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 42).

Etabba is Mestawat's mother. She was very sad about her daughter's paralysis. For example, once, while her mother was sitting under the verandah, Mestawat was telling us what Etabba felt from within. According to Mestawat's narration, Etabba was upset when she saw her daughter. But how could a first-person narrator tell the inner feeling of a character by mere seeings from the outside. Here, Mestawat looks like an omniscient narrator, who presents a story by reading a character's mind. Mestawat also says the following: "... ሻምበል ... ዳግመኛ ሊናገር እንዳልፈለገ ገባኝ።" (እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፡ 71) "... I learned that ... the captain does not want to talk again" (Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 71).

In this statement, Mestawat was reading captain Amha's mind and telling about his desire or feeling, which he did not tell her as she claimed that he would not talk again with Dr. Tefera. So, unless captain Amha told Mestawat about his desire and feeling, it would be impossible for a first-person narrator to know the desire of a character by reading the mind. It is thus by surpassing the limitation of the first-person narrator that we observe her telling a story like an omniscient narrator. Here is another instance: "... እንግዶቹ [ለፋሲካ ባደረኩላቸው ግብዣ] እንደተደሰቱ ... ልረዳ ቻልኩ ... በጣም የተደሰቱት በእኔ ሁኔታ እንደሆነ ስለገባኝ የእኔም ደስታ ወሰን አልነበረውም ... " (እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፡ 103) "... I learned that my guests were delighted ... [by Easter banquet I invited to them]. When I also discovered that the cause of their joy was my health condition, I was much more delighted" (Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 103).

At Mestawat's residence guests were invited for the Easter feast (occasion). She was telling us that those guests enjoyed the banquet, and were delighted with the betterment of her health condition. She told us this without hearing them saying it. Therefore, such kind of telling a story seems to be mere speculation. This is because the position of Mestawat as a narrator does not allow her to do so. As a

result, she is a narrator who has forgotten the position and the boundary a first-person narrator has and so is unreliable.

Forgetfulness is another important characteristic of Mestawat's narration of Enbuttee Tsigerida. For instance, she is sometimes seen forgetting to tell the readers about the events and actions, which she has to tell, and sometimes she repeats the actions and events she has already told. She even sometimes stops telling and forgets once and for all the events and the characters and their whereabouts. To prove Mestawat's forgetfulness, let me deal with these examples:

ሻምበል አምሐ የፖሊስ መለዎውን በእጁ እንደያዘ ወደ እኔ ተጠጋና ... እኔ ዛሬ ደብረ ዘይት መሄድ አለብኝ ... በሉ ደሀና ቆዩኝ አለና እኔንና ዶክተርን ከጨበጠ በኋላ ... ከግቢያችን ወጥቶ ሄደ።

(እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 109)

As Captain Amha, holds his police cap in his hand, he came close to me ... and said: "Today, I have to go to Debre Ziet". Then he shook Doctor Tefera and me ... and went out of our compound.

(Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 109)

Captain Amha is a character in Enbuttee Tsigerida, who has been an active participant in the story which Mestawat narrates. So, here we hear him saying: "I have to go to Debre Ziet". Captain Amha is also a policeman, who has been on duty investigating the crime committed on Mestawat. It is for the purpose of this investigation that he has to go to the town mentioned. However, after his departure for Debre Zeit nothing is heard from Mestawat about him. Even upto the conclusion of the story nothing has been told to readers about the where about of Captain Amha. Has he returned to Addis? or has he stayed in Debre Ziet? What is the result of his investigation? Has he found the criminal or not? What is the general condition of Captain Amha? All these questions could be the questions of the readers. Nevertheless, Mestawat has forgotten to tell about

him (Captain). Also these questions have not been answered. In fact, the general movements and the actions of Captain Amha are the concerns of readers. They would like to know about him.

Another point to be raised to exemplify the forgetfulness of Mestawat is the confusion she makes on the name of her boss. Her is the confusion:

... አቶ ሳሙኤል ... ስለ ድርጅቱ አመሰራረት ዓላማና የእኔንም የሥራ ድርሻ ገለጡልኝ። ... የፋሚካ ሥራ አለቃዬ አቶ ዩሐንስ ሳሙኤልና አካባቢው ተስማምተውኛል።
(እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 247-250) (መስመሮች የተጨመሩ)

... Ato Samuel ... briefed me about the establishment and objectives of the enterprize, as well as the job responsibility I have. My boss, FAMICO's Manager Ato Yohannes Samuel, and the general working environment [of FAMICO] have been suitable and appropriate to me.
(Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 247-250) (underlying mine).

If we give attention to the underlined names in the quotation, we can recognise, the confusion Mestawat makes on the name of her boss. When she tells us about him in the story, on page 247, she gives him the name Ato (Mr.) Samuel; however, on page 250 she uses Ato (Mr.) Yohannes Samuel as the name of her boss. So, Mestawat has forgotten the right name of her boss, so, forgetfulness of her is reflected.

Again, here is another phenomenon which shows Mestawat's forgetfulness. Once, she introduces a character called Abyie Balclha and his profession. This is how she says it: “እህት ተጫወቼ ብቸኝነት አይሰማሽ' አለኝ አቢይ ባልቻ በሙያው ሰዐሊ መሆኑን ከገለጸልኝ በኋላ” (እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 171) (መስመሮች የተጨመሩ) “‘Sister! don't feel lonely, play on!’ said Abyie Ballcha after he told me that he is a painter by profession” (Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 171) (underlining mine).

The above quotation is taken from page 171. In this statement Mestawat introduces the reader to Abyie Ballcha who is an artist (painter) by profession. Readers have known him and his profession. However, forgetting that she has already given the introduction of Abyie's profession on the previous page, she tells us the same thing again on the following page (172) and then she says: "...ዕቢይ የምኖረው ኬንታክ ነው ... የመጣው ... የሀገሪን ውበት ለመንደፍ ነው ፔይተር ነኝ አለና ... ነገረኝ" (እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 172) (መስመር ፋተጨመረ)" "[Abyie told me where he lives and his profession] and he said: 'I live in Kentucky ... I am a painter. I came here to draw (sketch) the landscape of my country'" (Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 172) (underlining mine).

So, Mestawat presents the same story on the consecutive pages. Such repeated narration (story) may be boring to readers or it may lead them to suspect the narrator's ability to present the story in the proper way, as well as his/her knowledge of the story he/she tells.

Mestawat, is not only a forgetful narrator, but she is also a liar. She lies while telling about the events and actions which happened in the story of Enbuttee Tsigerida. For instance, let us examine the following quotation.

በሥርዓት መግር ያልቻሉ ... ጓደኞቼ ... ቢወድቁም እኔም ከወዳጅዎቼ አንዷ ሆኛለሁ። ... ከምኒልክ ት/ቤት ብዙ ልጆች መውደቃቸውን የእኔንም አለግለፍ እታገ ጠይቃ ደረሰችበትና በመውደቁ ሳይሆን በመዋሽቴ አዘነችብኝ።
(እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 142) (መስመር ፋተጨመረ)

Even though my friends who did not strictly follow their education (study) ... failed I was also one of them. ... So when my mother (Etabba) came to know that I and a great number of other students in Menilik school had failed, she was worried not because I failed [the examination], but because I lied to her that I passed the exam.
(Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 142) (underlining mine)

While Mestawat was learning in Menlik school, she failed an examination; however, she told her mother that she had passed and deceived her. Nevertheless, when her mother heard that Mestawat did not pass the examination, she was worried about her daughter's lie. Mestawat, lied not only to her mother, but she also lied to her father. The following is how her father Teshale describes it in his letter to Mestawat:

ውድ ልጅ ሆይ! ... ስላንቺ ምንም ቢባል አላምንም!
 አልቀበልም! ስል ከቆየሁ በኋላ ወድቀሽ ትምህርት ቤት
 መቀየርሽን ... ሳረጋግጥ ልጅ ለእኔ ለአባቷ እንደት ትዋሻለች?
 በማለት ... ጥቂት ልወቅሰሽ ፈለግሁ።

(እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 143)

My dear daughter! ... I was in a position not to accept the bad things people said about you, but when I ... proved that you failed your examination and was transferred to another school, I started to contemplate ... about 'how my daughter could lie to me? and wanted to somewhat blame you for it.

(*Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 143*)

Teshale, complained in his letter that his daughter Mestawat lied to him. Though he accepted her good personality as well as her talent. He knew that she was a brilliant student and had no expectation that she would be unsuccessful in her education, but the unexpected had happened as Mestawat failed in her class examination. However, when she wrote a letter to him, she lied by declaring that she had passed the class examination. Unfortunately, Teshale knew the truth about her education and criticized her.

The lies of Mestawat as a narrator can be observed again in her talks with her co-worker Menbere. This is the text:

... ከእትዬ መንበረ ጋር ለሻይ ክበብ ወርደን ... ራስ ምታት
 አጣደፈኝ 'እትዬ መንበረ! እኔ ልሂድ ... ከእናቴ ስልክ
 እጠብቃለሁ' አልኩና ዋሽቼ ደረጃውን እንደት እንደወጣሁ
 ሳላውቅ ቢሮ በር ላይ ደረሰኩ።

(እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ፣ 1982፣ 1271)

... I and Menbere had been in the lounge [drinking tea]; however, while we were there I had a strong head-ache and then lied to Menbere that I expected ... a telephone call from my mother, and went out of the lounge in a hurry to my office.

(Enbuttee Tsigerida, 1982: 217)

Mestawat lied also to her colleague. In fact, she did not have an appointment for a telephone call from her mother, but the main reason that pushed Mestawat to lie to Menbere was the coming of Dr. Terefe to the lounge. He sat with them and then began to talk about the photograph which he had seen in the Piazza Photo Studio. Since the photograph belonged to Mestawat, she was ashamed of it and then gave a false reason to Menbere to go out of the lounge.

To generalize the function of Mestawat as a first-person narrator, in brief, here are some points to be mentioned about the story she narrated and the general behaviour reflected in it. These are that the story is her own biography, the events of the story are the ones which happened in her life two years before, and that the story is narrated in a flash-back technique.

When Mestawat presents the story of Enbuttee Tsigerida and adopts the function of a first-person narrator, she sometimes reflects unnecessary behaviour such as boasting about herself, especially about her beauty and personality; forgets to tell about the events which she has to tell; surpasses the boundary which a first-person narrator has in his jurisdiction of narrating a story; tells a story as an omniscient narrator; and lies like an unreliable narrator. So, these are the limitations which are reflected in Mestawat's narrating function.

Now, we shall start to analyze and examine another narrator called Getaneh Yeayehyrad – the narrator of the novel Yewedianesh.

5.3 Getaneh Yeayehyerad

The novel Yewedianesh has been narrated by Getaneh Yeayehyerad. He is a homodigetic narrator, who participates in the story he tells. Of course, he is a main character as well. So, the story he tells is his own and the character called Yewedianesh.

When he begins to tell the story, he starts it by telling the condition of his family. He introduces the social status of his family, the characteristics of his father and mother and the like. Along with it he introduces himself. However, his self-introduction was not directly and consciously done, but it was presented in an indirect way. It is, through the mouth of a character called Wezero Yewoubedar that the physical appearance of Getaneh has been to a limited extent described. When Getaneh tells us what Wezero Yewoubedar said about his physical appearance, he says it as follows:

... ወ/ሮ የውብዳር ... እኔንም እናቴንም በአንድ ጊዜ ለማስደሰት ... የጌታነህ መልክ እየዋለ እያደረ ይወጣ ጀመር በማለት ... ያፍንጫው ስልክክ እያለ መምጣት፣ የፀጉሩ መቸምቸምና የግንባሩ መግጠም ባካልጌቶችን ሆነ ከምኔም ከምኔም ደስ የሚሉኝ ... ነጭጭ ጥርሶቹ ናቸው። [አሉ]
(የውዲያነሽ፣ 1982፣ 17)

... To please both my mother and me at the same time, Wezero Yewoubedar ... begins to talk about my physical appearance, and she says: ... 'as time passes Getaneh becomes more and more handsome... his big nose being longer, his hair being thickened, and his narrow forehead ... are a very close resemblance to his father... Apart from all these, I am pleased with his very white teeth'.

(Yewedianesh, 1978: 17)

This is the way Getaneh is physically described by Wezero Yewoubedar: he has a big nose, thick hair, a narrow forehead, and very white teeth. Also some introductions are given about his education, business and family status. Regarding his educational status, this is what he says: "... ካለፉት ሦስት ዓመታት

ወዲህ የጀመርኩትን ... ትምህርት በመከታተል በአዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ የንግድ አስተዳደር የሦስተኛ ዓመት ተማሪ ሆንኩ” (የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 150). “By following my education at Addis Ababa University which I started after the last three years, I am now a third year Business Administration Student” (Yewedianesh, 1978: 150). It is stated that Getaneh was a student at Addis Ababa University and he was following his education in the evening program. So, in the day time he had a job though it was not described as to what it was and where. Regarding his family status, we are told that he was living with his parents for sometime and he was a bachelor, but after he made contact with Yewedianesh, he left his parents and took her as his wife leading a life with her.

So, as is mentioned earlier, he tells the story of his own and his wife Yewedianesh. However, in his narration, his eyes were more focused on Yewedianesh and told us more about her. In his telling of the story of Yewedianesh, some defects which have to be raised and discussed here are reflected. For example, he is seen telling about the events, actions etc. which are beyond his vision. Sometimes he repeats the narration and sometimes he makes confusion in the process of his telling about Yewedianesh. Apart from this, behaviourally Getaneh is boastful and inconsistent. As a result, he is unreliable. Now we will raise and discuss some of Getaneh’s limitations in his narration of the story of Yewedianesh.

Getaneh, as a first-person narrator, has to present the events and actions of characters just as he observes and understands them-from the outside. Since he is not an omniscient narrator, readers do not expect him to tell them what exists in the characters’ mind, and what they feel, think, like, dislike etc. Reading the minds of characters and knowing their inner feelings is beyond the perception of a first-person narrator. On the contrary, Getaneh is seen telling the inner

motives, feelings, thoughts of characters as well as their past and future, joy and sorrow. For instance, when he tells the previous life experience of Yewedianesh, he says: “አዲሲቱ ሠራተኛ ያሳለፈችው ውራጅ ሕይወትና የዘቀጠ ኑሮ ... ታየኝ” (የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፡ 24) “I could imagine the down-trodden life which the new house maid survived” (Yewedianesh, 1978: 24).

Here, Getaneh tells us Yewedianesh’s life experience. He tells this by merely observing the physical structure of Yewedianesh’s a very thin body, also the shabby clothes she wore. Otherwise, he heard nothing about the past life of Yewedianesh. Of course, in what condition she had been found in the past and what kind of life she had been leading before, are beyond the knowledge of Getaneh.

Here is another instance Getaneh tells: “እሁድ አራት ሰዐት ገደማ ነበር ቀላል የራስ ምታት [ሰላመመኝ] ከመኝታዬ ሳልነሳ አረፈድኩ። ተነስቼ የወጣሁ ስለመሰላት አልጋ ለማንጠፍ [መኝታ ክፍሌ] ዘው አለኝ” (የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፡ 33)” (መስመር የተጨመረ) “It was on Sunday at about 10 o’clock in the morning that I suffered from a headache and, as a result, stayed lying down on my bed. Then assuming that I was away, she entered my room to make my bed” (Yewedianesh, 1978: 33) (underlining mine).

The narrator tells about the new house-maid-Yewedianesh. As he tells it, Yewedianesh’s purpose of getting into Getaneh’s room was to make his bed. However, how could he know that the real aim or purpose of her coming into his room was to make a bed? She could have entered to put something in the room, or to take something out of it. It could be to sweep the floor or to check something and return. It is unknown. We can imagine many other things and actions. The real thoughts are hidden in the mind of Yewedianesh. So, Getaneh

can never tell, surely and deadly, that Yewedianesh's coming to his bed room was to make his bed.

Again Getaneh is heard saying: "Assuming my absence ...". How could he know the "assumption" of Yewedianesh? We know that "assumption" is a thought process, which takes place in the mind. So, as a first-person narrator, Getaneh can't tell the thoughts of the mind. Thus, he told the story as an omniscient narrator forgetting the position of the first-person narrator.

He repeatedly assumes the position of an omniscient narrator. Let us observe another instances in the following quotation: "እናቴ አንድ ሀሳብ ወደ አእምሮቿ መጣና ... እስኪ ... ተካባች ሙች በለኝ ... ልቦናህም አልከጀላት? ብላ ጠየቀችው" (የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 47-48) (መስመር የተጨመረ) "An idea raised in my mother mind ... and then she said: Can you swear by calling my name ... that you have not had any desire to or interest in her?" (Yewedianesh, 1978: 47-48) (underlying mine).

Getaneh was narrating about one occasion when his parents were sitting together and talking about a family issue. As he was telling us about their talk, he said that "an idea came to" his mother's mind. This shows that Getaneh seems to read his mother's mind. Otherwise, he can not tell us. According to his narration, the idea raised in his mother's mind was about Yewedianesh. He knew it (the issue) before his mother forwarded it to his father. But Getaneh was a mere observer of the scene in which his father and mother were in. He could hear what they were talking about, but he did not have any opportunity of knowing what was going on in his parents' mind; though he told it to the readers, before his parents uttered it. This is something impossible.

Here is another example where Getaneh narrates by reading the mind of a character just like an omniscient narrator. “... ነይ እንጂ ግቢ የወዲያነሽ! ብዬ አባባልኳት። ውስጥ ውስጡን የበላይዋ አዛዥ መሆኔ ስለተሰማት በፍርሀት እየተናጠች ገባች” (የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 50) (መስመሮች የተጨመሩ)። (... I invited Yewedianesh to come in [the room]. As she feels in her mind that I am her superior boss, she entered in a humiliated and frightened manner” (Yewedianesh: 1878: 50) (underlining mine).

In this quotation, Getaneh tells what Yewedianesh feels in her mind, as he is inviting her to enter his room. He describes that moment’s feeling of Yewedianesh as: “She feels in her mind that I am her superior and boss”. This kind of story telling is not expected from a first-person narrator. In most parts of the story of Yewedianesh, we can observe Getaneh telling the story in such a manner. Functioning as an omniscient narrator can be taken as one of the behaviours Getaneh reflects.

He also reflects a boastful behaviour in his narration. He boasts of many things and deeds. For instance, let us have a glimpse of one of the instances in the following quotation:

አየህ አባይ! ... ላንተ የምትስማማህና ደስ የምትል ለእኔ ደስ
አትለኝም ይሆናል ... ማንኛውም ሰው አለማወቅ ወይም
ድንቁርና ብዙ እንዲያደንቅ ... በጠባብ አስተሳሰብ እንዲመራ
ሊያስገድዱት ይችላሉ እኔ [ግን] ከጠባብ አስተሳሰብ
ተላቅቄያለሁ ... አልኩት
(የወዲያነሽ፣ 1982፣ 17)(መስመር የተጨመረ)

I said to my father: ‘You see! ... A woman who is suitable and pleasant to you may not be pleasing to me. ... Many people may be led by ignorance and short sightedness to admire everything, ... [but I do not do it,] because I am free from ... a narrow mindedness.

(Yewedianesh, 1978: 117) (underlining mine)

Getaneh and his father were talking on the issue of marriage. Getaneh comments on the choice of his father, and forwarded his personal view. However, in his comment he is seen boasting about himself. He says: “I am free from narrow mindedness.” He considers himself as a man who has a deeper and broader thinking ability. He compares himself with others as: “some people who are pushed by ignorance and narrow thoughts do what they do not believe in”. And so, he has a different personality. He boasts that he is free from ignorance and a narrow way of thinking. He strengthens this idea when he says: “የጨነቀኝ ባለቤቴንና ልጄን ከእነዚያ በእኔ አስተሳሰብና ትክክለኛ እምነት ከማያምኑት ወላጆቹ ጋር የማገናኝበት ... መንገድ [ነው] (የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 236) (መስመር የተጨመረ) “What worries me is the way by which my wife and child are brought to my parents who do not believe in my correct thoughts and beliefs” (Yewedianesh, 1978: 236) (underlining mine). This sentence reflects Getaneh’s boasting thoughts. He condemns his parents as if they are opposed to him, and are unwilling to accept his way of thinking. He is giving witness to himself as the possessor of “the right and correct thought”. However, giving once own witness to himself is not different from calling oneself as “the best” and “the most” one, thus which reflects self ego. Hence, Getaneh is boasting since he is saying that he is on the right track and not his parents.

He is also always proud and gives praise to himself. For example, once when he talks with his sister about his seriousness and curiosity in keeping a secret, he states as follows:

“አባቴ ስለአንተና ስለ የወዲያነሽ ምንም ነገር እንዳልሰማና ... እንዳላወቀ ታውቃለህ ብላ ንግግሯን ጀመረች ...” [እኔም] ጠንቃቃነቴንና ለጉዳዩ ያለኝን ክፍተኛ ግምት በግልፅ ለማስረዳት 'አንቺና እማማስ ብትሆኑ ካባረራችኋት በኋላ ስለእርሷ ምን የምታውቁት ነገር ነበር?...' [አልኳት]
 (የወዲያነሽ፣ 1982፣ 312) (መስመር የተጨመረ)

She begins her speech by saying: “Do you know that my father hasn’t ... heard and known anything about [the friendship there

is between] you and Yewedianesh?” and in order to show my carefulness and make clear openly, the highest regard I had given to the matter, I said: “what do you and mother know about her after you have expelled her?...”

(Yewedianesh, 1978: 312) (underlining mine)

In the above quotation the underlined phrase indicates, the self-praising characteristic of Getaneh. He attributes to himself a very sincere and disciplined behavior in keeping a secret. In this, Getaneh is a boastful narrator and this behaviour of his is known even by his relatives. Especially his father comments on him as: “... ለጉራ ማን ብሉህ! ማን ይችላህና ... ጉራ የሚያሾምና የሚያሸልም ቢሆን አንደኛ ትሆን ነበር። ይልቅ በጉራ እንዳትሞት ... (የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 325-339) “You are the first in bragging! ... Of course, who can compete with you. ... If boasting can bring promotion and reward, you can be the first to get it. However, it is better for you if you can guard against going into difficulties ...” (Yewedianesh, 1978: 325-339).

Here, Getaneh’s father clearly presents the boastful characteristic of his son. However, such a boasting behaviour of a narrator has a very bad impact on the story he tells. Readers may discredit all what he presents and tells. They may lack curiosity to follow the story told and refrain from identifying themselves with such a narrator and his life experience.

Furthermore, Getaneh is also seen lying about another issue, let us now observe the following quotation:

[የውብነሽ] እስኪ ይህን ልጅ ተመልከቼው ... ቆንጆ ልጅ አይደለም እንደ? ብዬ ጠየቅኳት ... የማነው ልጅ ብላ ለማወቅ በጓጓ ሰሜት ጠየቀኝኝ ... አንቺ የማታውቁው አንድ ጓደኛ ነበረኝ የዚህ ልጅ አባት ማለቴ ነው ... ከአንድ አመት በፊት በድንገተኛ የመኪና አደጋ ሞቷል ... ለጊዜው አሳዳጊ ዘመድ በማጣቱ ይኼው ... እዚህ በምታደው ሁኔታ በማደግ ላይ ይገኛል ... አባቴን በማሰብና ለልጁ በማዘን ብቻ ብቅ እያልኩ እጠይቀዋለሁ ... ብዬ ዋሸኳት።

(የወዲያነሽ፣ 1982፣ 148-149)

“Yewoubnesh! Would you look at this child. ... Is he not handsome?” I demanded her. She anxiously asked me to know his father. ... Accordingly, I said “The father of this child was ... my friend whom you don’t know. He died in a car accident one year ago. Since he couldn’t find a relative who takes care of him, he is being assisted in the situation you see him here. Because of the consideration I give to his father and the sympathy I offer to the child, I occasionally come and visit him,” saying so I lied to my sister.

(Yewedianesh, 1978: 148-149)

In this instance, we see Getaneh talking to his sister about his own child. The child is being brought up in an orphanage. Since, he was taken from the street when Yewedianesh lost him. Therefore, not to expose that the child is his, Getaneh purposely lied. Let us again observe Getaneh’s false statement:

ጋሻይነህን ... አየኸው [አለች የወዲያነሽ] ... አይቺዋለሁ ከዚያ ስመለስ ግን ወደ ጉልላት ቤት ጎራ ብዬ ነበር ... እህቱ በጣም ታጣ ... እሷን ይዘን ወዲያ ወዲህ ስንል ዋልን ... አልኩና ... እውነትንና ሐሰትን አደባልቄ በመናገሪ ውስጣዊ ሀፍረት ተሰጣኝ ...

(የወዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 235)

“Have you visited ... Gashayeneh?” Yewedianesh asked me. “[Yes], I visited him ... and then of course I went to Gulelat’s house I said. We have been taking his sister to many places since ... she is very sick. As a result, I felt ashamed of telling her ... by mixing true and false information.”

(Yewedianesh, 1978: 235)

This quotation gives us another story fabricated by Getaneh. Of course, he himself assured us that he was telling a lie to his wife Yewedianesh. He mixed true and false information. In telling such information, Getaneh felt sad and was ashamed of it. Telling a story by mixing false and true ideas will not make readers assimilate the story told by such a narrator.

Then because of the lies of Getaneh, each action and event which takes place in the story and presented to the readers may said to be unreliable.

Of course, there are other pieces of evidence which show that Getaneh as a lying narrator. Fore example, let us examine the following in which Getaneh lies and makes Yewedianesh lie. He says: "... የውብነሽ አንድ ስጦታ ትሰጥሻለች ስጦታውምን እንደሆነ አላየሁም፤ አልጠየቅኋትም አንቺ ግን አሁን እኔ ምንም እንዳልነገርኩሽ ሆነሽ ... ተቀበያት (የውዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 271-272) "Yewoubenesh will give you a gift, of course. I did not see what the gift is and I didn't ask her about it. Contact her and receive the gift pretending as if I didn't tell you anything about it" (Yewedianesh, 1978: 271-272).

In this instance, Getaneh tells Yewedianesh that his sister will give her a gift. He also advised her to contact his sister and collect the gift. However, he warns Yewedianesh not to admit that he told her about it. He himself is lying, he also lead Yewedianesh to lie.

At the same time in another occasion Getaneh is heard giving false information to Yewedianesh. The text is this:

[የውዲያነሽ] ... በጣም ቅር የሚለኝ ... ከአንቺ በምለይበት ጊዜ እንጂ ከወላጆቼ ከተለየሁማ ቆይቻለሁ አልኩና ጥርሱን የነቀለ ውሸት ዋሽሁ ... ሐሰቴ እውነት ስለመሰላት ለምን? ብላ ጠየቀኝ ... አልመለስኩላትም።

(የውዲያነሽ፣ 1978፣ 276)

I called her name, Yewedianesh, and lied by saying: "I feel extremely sad when I depart from you though I know my separation from my parents has been too long. Since she thought that these lies had been true she asked me "why?" though I didn't give a reply to it.

(Yewedianesh, 1978: 276)

Here is an instance of Getaneh's flattery, he flatters and deceives Yewedianesh, by telling her that he loves her very much. He tells her that he would feel sad, if he departs from her. Nevertheless, his statement is fake and untrue.

In general, when Getaneh is evaluated as a first-person narrator, he is a boaster, who praises himself, and justifies his good personality and deeds; thus, because of this boasting behaviour, readers may neglect his personality. Moreover, they do not want to identify themselves with his character, as well as with his actions and deeds. Getaneh, sometimes deviates from the position he has taken as a first-person narrator. This is because he attempts to present the story of Yewedianesh as an omniscient narrator. Therefore, he is seen reading the minds of characters, and presenting their thoughts, feelings ... etc. However, it is impossible for a first-person narrator to do so. Besides he tends to lie. While he tells the story of Yewedianesh he is seen deliberately lying about the events and actions which take place in the story. Hence, such a behaviour leads readers to suspect the truthfulness of the story, as well as the events and actions presented by him. These are all I have to say about the narrator of Yewedianesh. And now we will pass on to examining another first-person narrator called Tsegaye Hailemariam.

5.4 Tsegaye Hailemariam

Tsegaye Hailemariam is a narrator of the novel Oromay. He is a central character and a homodiegetic story teller who participates in the story he presents. He presented most parts of the story, of Oromay. However, besides him, there are other narrators who take his place and narrate the story. The real author of the novel is mentioned to be one of the narrators other than Tsegaye Hailemariam. Hence, Oromay is told from different angles of points of view, by different narrators. In the beginning, the narrator is the real author of the novel.

He begins to tell the story by introducing the main narrator Tsegaye Hailemariam, as well as himself. This is how he starts:

... ይህ የፀጋዬ ኃይለማርያም ታሪክ ነው። ፀጋዬ ኃይለማርያም ማነው? ... በራሱ ቋንቋና አስተሳሰብ፣ ስሜትና እይታ ድርጊትና ዝምታ ፀጋዬ ራሱ ታሪኩን ይገልፃልሁል ... ፀጋዬ ውሱን ተራ ሟች ስለሆነ በሁሉም ጊዜና ቦታ የመገኘት ችሎታ የለውም እሱ በማይገኝበት ጊዜና ሰፍራ አንዳንድ ብቅ እላለሁ። ... ማን ይሆን ብለህ አትመራመር ... ደራሲው ነኝ።

(አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 5)

... This is ... the story of Tsegaye Hailemariam. Who is Tsegaye Hailemariam? ... Tsegaye will tell you the story, with his own language and thought, with his point of view (stand point), actions and silence. Since Tsegaye is mortal and is limited in time and place, he has no ability to be present at all times and places. Therefore, sometimes where and when Tsegaye is unable to be present, I shall appear ... Do not bother about who says so ... I am the author.

(Oromay, 1975: 5)

As it is stated in the above quotation, the story of the novel Oromay is the story of Tsegaye Hailemariam. Thus he tells his own story. However, when Tsegaye is in a situation in which he can not tell the story, the real author of the novel will get into Tsegaye's shoes and narrate the story. Besides, the narrator of Oromay, Tsegaye Hailemariam, has been introduced to the reader by the real author. When the author introduces him, he focused more on the behaviour of Tsegaye. He says as: “ፀጋዬን ከራሱ ይበልጥ አውቀዋለሁ። የእግዚር በግ ነው። በሕይወት የሚያየውን ነገር ሁሉ ይወዳል ውደታው ብዙውን ጊዜ ከአቅሙ በላይ ይሆንበታል” (አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 5) “I know Tsegaye more than he knows himself. He is God's lamb. He loves everything he has come across in life. He loves much more than he can afford.” (Oromay, 1975: 5).

Tsegaye Hailemariam, according to the given description is an innocent person. Being innocent, he falls in love with all he sees, and comes in touch with. However, he has no ability to entertain all that he loves. This behaviour of Tsegaye is presented by the author to the reader, as well as by Tsegaye himself. Look at what, Tsegaye says:

... ልቤ ሁለት ሴቶች እንደት ብሎ አኩል ሊወድ ይችላል?
በየ ተገረምኩ። ... ያሰርኩት ቃል ኪዳን እንደ እሾህ ወጋች
... በዘምባባዎች ጥላ ሥር ያገኙት ፍቅር ... በቀላሉ የሚረሳ
ባለመሆኑ የሚደማውን ልቤን የባሰውኑ ጨመቀው ... እና
እንዲህ ዐይነቱ ነገር ደግሞ ጅልነት ነው ምን ላድርግ? ጅል
ነኝ ...

(አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 268-269)

... "How can I love two women equally?" I said. ... being surprised. ... The promise I gave pricked me like a thorn. The love I come across under a palm tree [of Asmara]... is not easily forgettable and very hard to the deep feeling I am involved in. ... So, such phenomenon is a foolish. Hence, what can I do? I am foolish (stupid).

(Oromay, 1975: 268-269)

In the above quotation, Tsegaye asserts that he loves someone he comes across in life. For instance, in one moment, he loved two women. These women were: Roman Heletework and Fiammetta Gilia. The former who was Tsegaye's fiancée was living in Addis Ababa. On the other hand, the latter to whom Tsegaye was introduced in Asmara was also his lover. Loving two women at the same time was a painful trap of him. He loved both of them and was unable to decide to separate from them. So he asked himself what he could do to alleviate this problem. Then what he did astonished him and called himself foolish.

Again Tsegaye's profession was also introduced to the reader. The introduction is done indirectly through the mouth of a character called Səlia. Together with his profession, his personality is described. For example, when Səlia tells about

Tsegaye's profession, he said: “**ፀጋዬ ... ልምድ ያለው ጋዜጠኛ ነው**” (አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 223) “Tsegaye is ... an experienced journalist” (Oromay, 1975: 223).

Because of the experience he has in journalism, he became head of Red Star Campaign's propaganda and agitation section. A character called Yohannes described it like this: “**ፀጋዬ ተራ ጋዜጠኛ አይደለም። ለመረጃ ያህል የቀይ ኮከብ ዘመቻው የፕሮፖጋንዳና ቅስቀሳ ኃላፊ ነው ... እንደ ሌሎች ጋዜጠኞች ዝም ብሎ የሚቀጣጥር ሰው አይደለም። በሕዝብ ዘንድ ያለው ተደማጭነት ከፍተኛ ነው...**” (አሮማይ፣ 1975፣ 144-145) “Tsegaye is not an ordinary journalist. For your information, he is head of the Red Star Campaign's Propaganda and Agitation Section ... As such, he is not a yellow journalist like other journalists. So, he has great popularity and acceptance by the public” (Oromay, 1975: 144-145).

As described above, Tsegaye Hailemariam, is an experienced, and publicly known journalist. This is the partial description of Tsegay's personality, his behaviour and profession.

Now, we will examine how Tsegaye, as a first-person narrator, executes his narrating function in Oromay.

First of all, a first-person narrator, as has been mentioned in the previous sections of this study, presents the events and actions which he/she has witnessed. He/she cannot present actions and events that have taken place in his/her absence. In addition, a first-person narrator does not have the ability of reading a character's mind and thus cannot tell the thoughts, feelings, etc. of characters. However, Tsegaye Hailemariam is sometimes seen telling the story of Oromay as an omniscient narrator.

For instance, when he tells about the beauty of his fiancée, he says: “**ሮግን ጎልተወርቅ ያያት ሁሉ ይሳሳላታል ... ባዩዋት ቁጥር ይቀኑባታል ዕድሌ ሆኖ ሴቶች አይወዱኝም ትላለች**” (አሮግይ: 1975: 9) “Those who look at Roman Heletework stare at her with love ... however, she says: ‘unfortunately women did not like me? Every time they look at her they always become envious of her’” (Oromay, 197: 9).

In the above quotation, Tsegaye tells about Roman Heletework and what people feel when they look at her. In stating that people look at Roman Heletework with love and that women are particularly envious of her, Tsegaye tracepasses his jurisdiction and tells the feelings of people. As a first-person narrator he is incapable of telling the inner feelings of a character. “Envy” and “loving” are internal feelings which are not plainly observable on the face of people. Therefore, Tsegaye is thus telling the story by reading the minds of characters as an omniscient narrator and going out of the scope given to the first-person narrator.

In the same way, he tells about a certain character called Major Tadesse Koricho. This is how he says it: “... **ሻለቃ ታደሰ ቆሪቾ ... ዐይኖቹ ብዙ አይተዋል፤ ብዙ ታሪክ መዝገበዋል። ባለፉት ሰባት ዓመታት ሰንበል ሜዳ ላይ ምን ያላየው ነገር ኖሯል?**” (አሮግይ: 1975: 33) “... Major Tadesse Koricho’s ... eyes observed and recorded so many happenings and historical events. For example, in the last seven years, what had he not observed when he was at Senbale Airfield (aeroplane station)?” (Oromay, 1975: 33).

Major Tadesse Koricho had been at Senbele Airfield for seven years and Tsegaye had not been there, and the major neither did tell Tsegaye about the events and phenomena which he (the major) had come across or experienced. But Tsegaye told us the past history of Major Tadesse. He told us as though he had been with

the major, or as if he had told him. This actually shows that Tsegaye told the story as an omniscient narrator. In fact, Tsegaye did not tell the reader how he found Major Tadesse or learned, his past history and that is why we say his narration is like an omniscient story teller.

Another instance refers to Tsegaye's narration about Mestehafe Daniel, a character in the same novel. He states it as follows: "የኢኮኖሚ መምሪያውን ኃላፊ መጽሐፈ ዳንኤልን በዐይኔ ሰረቅ አድርጎ አየሁ ሥጋት አድርበት ሆኖን ያከ ነበር" (አሮማይ: 1975: 66) "I partially and carefully saw Mestehafe Daniel, who is the head of the Economic Department Section. He felt over conscious and started scratching his belly as though it was itching him" (Oromay, 1975: 66).

Tsegaye was describing the mood and situation Mestehafe Daniel was in, while the meeting was in progress. Since Tsegaye was a participant, he could easily see the general situation he was in. However, he could not understand his inner feelings as an omniscient narrator. Besides, they sat apart and could not exchange information. In spite of all this, however, Tsegaye was seen repeatedly presenting what was going on in Mestehafe Daniel's mind. This is also reflected when he describes the bandit, Sielay's physical appearance and his behaviour. For example, look at this statement: "... ሥዕላይ ቁመቱ ዘለግ ያለ፣ ቀጭን፣ ጉረኛ ቢጤ ነው። ዐይኖቹ ትናንሽ ናቸው" (አሮማይ: 1975: 87)(መስመር የተጨመረ) "...Sielay [is physically] he is a thin and tall. His eyes are small; and he is somewhat a boaster" (Oromay, 1975: 87) (underlining mine).

The narrator gave the physical appearance of Sielay in this quotation. He described him when he met him for the first time at Solomon Betere's residence. Tsegaye said: "Sielay is some what of a boaster". He described the behaviour of Sielay. However, it is not possible for a first-person narrator to tell the behaviour

of a character by mere seeing only. It is beyond the knowledge and ability of the first-person narrator to do so.

So, when Tsegaye Hailemariam assumes the position of the first-person narrator he knows how to fulfil his responsibility. However, sometimes he tells the story as an “omniscient” narrator. This is a limitation of him.

Now let us pass to the last part and conclusion of this paper, and conclude the work.

CONCLUSION

In this study an attempt has been made to make a comparative study of the narrative techniques of: Settegñña Adari, Enbutte Tsigerida, Yewedianesh and Oromay. More specifically, this study focuses on examining the first-person narrative technique, and observing the advantages and disadvantages of it.

Hence, as has been traced in the novels and pointed out in this study, telling or presenting a story in the first-person narrative technique is more disadvantageous than advantageous. Because of the limitations that the first-person narrator has, the author has no chance to tell about every event, and action which is found beyond the reaches and vision of the narrator. The author is also bounded by the knowledge of the narrator who does not have the access to giving comments directly.

Therefore, this story telling method needs developed talent of an author to use it effectively. In fact, to gain the advantages of this technique, and using it effectively, properly characterizing the first-person narrator is needed. Of course, when an author decides to present his story in the first-person narrative technique, first of all he has to view the general capacity and knowledge of that narrator as a single person. So when we evaluate and compare the four authors, in relation to their works and their dealing of the first-person narrative technique, we shall trace some similarities and differences between them.

Of course, all of them present their stories in the first-person point of view. Their similarities and differences are reflected in the characterization of their narrators, in applying the first-person narrator and in telling their stories in a vivid way.

So, Negash G/Mariam, Wondimu Negash , and Hailemeleket Mawale have characterized only one main narrator in their stories, therefore, in doing so they reflect similarities. However, by drawing other narrators besides the main narrator, Bealu Girma differs from the other three authors.

Although the three authors, are closely similar in assigning one main narrator to their stories, they also show some differences in characterizing their particular narrators.

For instance, Negash has drawn a female narrator, who tells (presents) her autobiography. Wondimu Negash has also drawn a female narrator; however, he has not given her the status of an author like that of Negash's narrator. Hailemeleket and Bealu differ from these authors in their drawing of male narrators. Again, both of them show differences when we examine their narrators. The former draws a narrator who tells the whole story by standing a little bit away from the main narrator. But the latter (Bealu) draws a narrator who tells the story in turn by exchanging his place with other narrators.

Except Bealu the other three authors' narrators tell personal stories; they deal with their own life history and of other persons. However, Bealu's narrator tells the story which more than half of it was once a real issue in Ethiopia. So, the story has a historical background; and it was a political issue which was based on the Red Star Campaign. Therefore, the story presented by Bealu's narrator reflects more of the social and political issues of Ethiopia rather than the personal life history, or experiences of the narrator.

Negash's, Wondimu's and Bealus' narrators have identified professions. Negash has drawn his narrator as a prostitute. Wondimu has presented his narrator as a one time TV journalist, at other times as an advertizer of a certain agency's goods.

Bealu's narrator is presented as a professional TV journalist. However, Hailemeleket differs from all the other three authors in the fact that he has not distinctly identified his narrator's profession even though he says that his narrator has a certain office work.

All the four narrators have got modern education; however, they differ in the grade levels they have reached. For example, Negash's narrator, Inanu, has the level of a grade six education. Wondimu's narrator Mestawat has completed grade twelve. Hailemeleket's Getaneh is a university second year student. The grade level or the educational status of Bealu Girma's narrator has not been indicated in the novel. Nevertheless, since he is a professional journalist, it is certain that he has got modern education.

On the other hand, when we observe the narrative techniques which are used in the works of these authors, we again see similarities and differences. For instance, in Negash G/Mariam's work, we can trace more description while Wondimu has applied descriptive, flash back as well as epistolary methods. Hailemeleket entertained the first two techniques which Wondimu Negash has applied. Bealu has used more of various techniques such as flash back, description, dialogue, epistolary, foreshadowing and telephone methods.

So, of all these authors, Bealu has taken the first place in embodying different narrative methods in his work. Next comes Wondimu Negashi. Hailemeleket and Negash take the third and fourth place.

In the application of the narrative techniques, specially Bealu and Wondimu Negash have succeeded to overcome the limitations which their narrators faced. For instance, by embodying an epistolary method, Wondimu has told the story which is beyond the vision and reaches of his first-person narrator. Again Bealu

has done the same by using epistolary and telephone methods. Apart from this, by changing the first-person point of view into an omniscient point of view, he has managed to tell the story by reading the minds of the characters their past as well as their future lives.

In general, of the four authors, Bealu Girma has taken the top position in mixing point of views, and using different narrative techniques within the framework of the first-person narration. Of course, his way of telling a story with different narrators and different point of views (an omniscient and first-person point of view) has made me say that he has effectively and vividly used the first-person narrative technique.

Therefore, from Bealu's work, and this study, one important thing could be recognized and learned that is within a certain novel (story) which is presented from a certain point of view, it is possible to have a change of point of view, and narrator. To make a shift from one angle to the other and present a story within a mixed point of view.

Hence, such a narrating style which is observed in Oromay has to get consideration and be accustomed and developed by other Ethiopian writers. Of course, point of view mixation, Bealu's style seems very important narrative technique when story is presented in first-person narrator and to overcome this narrator's limitations.

Apart from this, this method seems a flexible, an attractive, and vivid one to tell a story. So, that is why I suggest that Ethiopian writers have to develop and entertain it in their coming (future) works.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anteneh Awoke. 1993. "The Roles of Narrators in Geez Narratives and Early Amharic Didactic Prose Fiction." Addis Ababa University. (A Thesis Presented to the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature for the Partial Fulfilment of MA Degree.)
- Baldic, Chris. 1990. Oxford Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Burack, A.S. 1964. The Writer's Hand Book. U.S.A.: The Writer, Inc.
- C. Hugh, Holman. 1980. A Hand Book to Literature. U.S.A.: The Books Merrill Co., Inc.
- Edgar, Pelhan. 1968. The Art of the Novel From 1700 to The Present. New York: Russell and Russell.
- Elizabeth, McMahan. 1986. Literature and the Writing Process. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Encyclopaedia Americana. 1995 (V.20). U.S.A.: Grolier Incorporated.
- Genette, Gerard. 1980. Narrative Discourse. New York. Cornell University Press.
- Grace, William J. 1965. Response to Literature. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Hawthorn, Jeremy. 1985. Studying the Novel. London: J. W. Arrow Smith Ltd. Bristol.
- Kennedy, X. J. 1991. Literature an Introduction to Fiction, Poetry, and Drama. U.S.A.: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Kirszner, Laurie G. and Mandell, Stephen R. 1991. Literature, Reading, Reacting, Writing. Chicago: Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Martin, Wallace. 1986. Recent Theories on Narrative. London: Cornell University Press.

- M. H. Abrams 1981. Glossary of Literary Terms. New York: Holt, Rinehart.
- Molvaer, Redidulf K. 1997. Black Lions. Asmara: The Red Sea Press, Inc.
- Nigussie Negashi. 1990. "Point of View in Andarge Mesfin's Tiquir Dem." Addis Ababa University. (A Thesis Presented to the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature for the Partial Fulfilment of BA Degree.)
- Nigussie Solomon. 1986. "The Narrative Techniques in the thirteenth Sun." Addis Ababa University. (A Thesis Presented to the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature for BA Degree.)
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. 1983. Narrative Fiction. London: Clays Ltd., St. Stives PLC.
- Roger, Fowler. 1973. A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms. London; Red Wood Burn Ltd.
- Romberg, Bertil. 1962. Studies in the Narrative Technique of The First-Person Novel. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Shipley, Joseph T. 1970. Dictionary of World Literary Terms. Boston: The Writer, Inc.
- Short, Mick. 1995. Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose. Lancaster: (No Printing Press).
- Taye Assefa. 1986. "Form in the Amharic Novel". London: (A Thesis Submitted to the University of London School of Oriental African Studies for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.)
- Wellek, Rene and Warren Austin. 1993. Theory of Literature. U.S.A.: Penguin Books.
- መርሻ አለሽኝ፣ 1990፣ "የትረካ ጊዜ በኃይለመለኮት መዋዕልና በየሺጥላ ኮከብ ልብወለድ ሥራዎች"። አዲስ አበባ። አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ። (ለኢትዮጵያ ቋንቋዎችና ሥነ ጽሑፍ ክፍል ለቢኤ ዲግሪ ማግኘት የቀረበ ጽሑፍ።)
- ሰለሞን ኃለፎም፣ 1986፣ "የሥነ ቃል ፋይዳ በየወዲያነሽና በጉንጉን"። አዲስ አበባ። አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ። (ለኢትዮጵያ ቋንቋዎችና ሥነ ጽሑፍ ክፍል ለቢኤ ዲግሪ ማግኘት የቀረበ ጽሑፍ።)

በዐሉ ግርማ፣ 1975፣ አሮማይ። አዲስ አበባ። ኩራዝ አሳታሚ ደርጅት። በቦሌ ማተሚያ ቤት ታተመ።

ኃይለመለኮት መዋዕለ፣ 1978፣ የወዲያነሽ። አዲስ አበባ። ኩራዝ አሳታሚ ደርጅት። በቦሌ ማተሚያ ቤት ታተመ።

አምባጭ ደገፉ፣ 1976፣ “የአንጻር ምርጫና አተራረክ ቴክኒክ በሃዲስ ዓለማዊና በበዐሉ ግርማ ልብወለድ ሥራዎች”። አዲስ አበባ። አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ። (ለኢትዮጵያ ቋንቋዎችና ሥነ ጽሑፍ ክፍል ለቢኤ ዲግሪ ማሟያ የቀረበ ጽሑፍ።)

አገኘሁ ተስፋ፣ 1984፣ “የአተራረክ ቴክኒክ በአሮማይ”። አዲስ አበባ። አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ። (ለኢትዮጵያ ቋንቋዎችና ሥነ-ጽሑፍ ክፍል ለቢኤ ዲግሪ ማሟያ የቀረበ ጽሑፍ)

ኢብራሂም ሐሰን፣ 1980፣ “ሥነ ጽሑፍ ትችት በየወዲያነሽ ላይ በተሰጡት የጋዜጣ ሂሳቦች”። አዲስ አበባ። አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ። (ለኢትዮጵያ ቋንቋዎችና ሥነ-ጽሑፍ ክፍል ለቢኤ ዲግሪ ማሟያ የቀረበ ጽሑፍ።)

እናኑ አጎናፍር፣ 1956፣ ጴተኛ አዳሪ። አዲስ አበባ። በብርሃንና ሰላም ቀ.ኃ.ሥ. ማተሚያ ቤት ታተመ።

ወንድሙ ነጋሽ፣ 1982፣ እንቡጥ ጽጌረዳ። አዲስ አበባ። ኩራዝ አሳታሚ ደርጅት። በቦሌ ማተሚያ ቤት ታተመ።


ዘረሁን አስፋው፣ 1992፣ የሥነ ጽሑፍ መሠረታዊያን። አዲስ አበባ። በንግድ ማተሚያ ደርጅት ታተመ።

ፋንታ አያሌው፣ 1980፣ “ከ1933-1990 ዓ.ም. የአማርኛ ልብወለዶች የአፃፃፍ ቴክኒክና ያነሷቸው ጉዳዮች”። አዲስ አበባ። አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ። (ለኢትዮጵያ ቋንቋዎችና ሥነ-ጽሑፍ ክፍል ለቢኤ ዲግሪ ማሟያ የቀረበ ጽሑፍ።)

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this study is my work and that all sources of material used for the study have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Hailu Abebe

Signature: 

Place: Institute of Language Studies,
Addis Ababa University

Date of Submission: May, 2001

