Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University
Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology
Linguistics and Translation Department

FIGHTING FOR LIVE IN J. MCGREGOR'S *LEAN, FALL, STAND*: STYLE AND NARRATIVE PERSPECTIVE

MA Paper

Ivan Nahornyi
Group MLAm-1-23-2.0d

Цим підписом засвідчую, що
подані на захист рукопис
та електронний документ
є ідентичні
02.06.2024

Research supervisor
Professor A.V. Chesnokova

Approved for defense at
the Linguistics and
Translation Department
25, May, 2025, Minutes 5
_____ Andrii KOZACHUK

Kyiv 2025

Київський столичний університет імені Бориса Грінченка
Факультет романо-германської філології
Кафедра лінгвістики та перекладу

ВЕРБАЛІЗАЦІЯ БОРОТЬБИ ЗА ЖИТТЯ У РОМАНІ ДЖОНА МАКГРЕГОРА «LEAN, FALL, STAND»: СТИЛІСТИЧНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ І ОПОВІДНА ПЕРСПЕКТИВА

Магістерська робота

Іван Нагорний
Група МЛАм-1-23-2.0д

Науковий керівник
Професор Г.В. Чеснокова

Рекомендовано до захисту на
на кафедрі лінгвістики та
перекладу
25 травня 2025 р., протокол № 5
_____ Андрій КОЗАЧУК

Київ 2025

Abstract

This study examines Jon McGregor's novel *Lean, Fall, Stand.* The author depicts survival as an immersive experience in three ways. They are: external crisis, physiological failure and cognitive-linguistic recovery. The purpose of the research is to find the narrative techniques. It is believed that they can make the reader empathise with the characters.

The research pursues five objectives:

1. To reveal linguistic and stylistic features.
2. To describe the use of omniscient and polyfocal narration.
3. To identify stream-of-consciousness and free indirect discourse passages.
4. To define the features of syntactic fragmentation.
5. To trace shifts in narrative pace and linguistic density across the novel.
6. To outline further implications.

McGregor uses narrative voice and stylistic and linguistic devices. It conveys characters' physiological and emotional states. As a result, empathy of the reader is intensified. This is what is stated by the hypothesis. The text of *Lean, Fall, Stand* is used as the material. A linguo-stylistic analysis guides close readings.

Findings confirm that polyfocal narration creates layered perspectives crisis of the crisis. At the same time, fragmented prose imitates the way of thinking of a person with hypothermia. The text contains a transition from physical crisis to speech rehabilitation. It conveys aphasia and identity reconstruction through free indirect discourse and syntactic rupture. In conclusion, survival as a lived, emotional phenomenon is represented by McGregor. It is done through tripartite design of the book and stylistic innovations. It offers new insights for narrative theory and practical models for teaching narrative voice and trauma representation.

Key words: narrative perspective, point of view, narrative voice, narrative techniques, free indirect speech, Leech and Short's heuristic checklist.

Introduction

In contemporary narrative studies, survival under extreme conditions repeatedly emerges as an arena. It tests human experience not only physically, but also emotionally and linguistically. Jon McGregor's *Lean, Fall, Stand* (2021) offers rich material for examining narrative techniques. Among these techniques are perspective, focalisation, voice and linguistic fragmentation. They are used to mediate the reader's immersion into characters' "fight for life." The novel portrays an Antarctic blizzard and its aftermath. There remains a lacuna in scholarship researching McGregor's narrative strategies. And moreover, how they depict survival as an emotional phenomenon experienced by the reader. By taking into account this gap, the present study seeks to reveal techniques using which the author influences readers. It can demonstrate that McGregor's storytelling is not only descriptive but also performative. One can say that readers are invited to experience disorientation, panic and physiological breakdown. It is done through the very syntax, rhythm and focal shifts of the prose. In doing so, this research contributes to narratology, cognitive stylistics, and trauma studies. For instance, it shows how narrative voice can convey the psychological realities of crisis and rehabilitation.

The object of research is narrative techniques that authors use in contemporary fiction to depict survival and resilience.

The implementation of perspective, focalisation, narrative voice and linguistic fragmentation in Jon McGregor's *Lean, Fall, Stand* to construct imagery of the characters' struggle for life is the subject of research.

The study distinguishes the broader object (narrative techniques in fiction) from the specific subject (McGregor's deployment of those techniques). It situates itself within general narratological inquiry. Also, it focuses on analysing a single text which is a novel.

The central research problem can be formulated as follows: In what ways do McGregor's narrative perspective, focalisation shifts and stylistic devices function to immerse readers in the embodied experience of survival, and how do these formal features evolve from the external crisis of the blizzard (*LEAN*) through the internal collapse of identity (*FALL*) to the protracted process of cognitive and linguistic recovery (*STAND*)?

From this problem arises the working hypothesis: McGregor's strategic use of third-person omniscient narration with polyfocal shifts, combined with stream-of-consciousness, free indirect discourse, and syntactic and phonological fragmentation, does not only retells survival events. It draws the reader into the characters' physiological and emotional states. In this way, it designs a deep empathy by properly recreating the struggles of life, death and identity reconstruction reconstruction.

Systematic analysis of passages from each section (*LEAN, FALL and STAND*) of the novel will serve as a test for this hypothesis since it correlates formal features with their imitative and emotional effects.

The main goal is to reveal the narrative strategies together with the linguistic and stylistic means. Through them Jon McGregor's *Lean, Fall, Stand* can create an immersive "fighting for life" imagery. It can show how form and content integrity to convey survival as both an external and internal challenge.

The specific objectives are the following:

1. To reveal linguistic and stylistic features in order to uncover how McGregor uses language to immerse the reader in the story.
2. To describe narrative perspective and focalisation shifts across the three parts of the novel, showing how a multi-perspective narrative created a panoramic although fractured view of crisis.
3. To analyse instances of stream-of-consciousness and free indirect discourse to determine how they simulate characters' immediate, instinctive thought loops in stressful situatioons.
4. To examine syntactic fragmentation and phonological devices (repetition, parataxis, disrupted word order) to illustrate their role in depicting aphasia, hypothermia-induced cognitive narrowing, and trauma-driven regression.
5. To compare the formal aspects of the *LEAN, FALL* and *STAND* sections, observing the transition from immediacy of impulses fuelled by the external factors to internally focused rehabilitation, and evaluating how changes

in narrative pace and linguistic composition reflect the characters' evolving survival challenges.

6. To present the theoretical and pedagogical implications of these findings for narratology, cognitive stylistics and creative writing pedagogy while indicating how McGregor's techniques might be taught or adapted in translation.

The research material is the complete text of Jon McGregor's *Lean, Fall, Stand* (2021), which was released by Fourth Estate. Passages have been selected to represent each of the following narrative phases:

1. *LEAN:* the storm in the Antarctic and how it affected Thomas, Luke and Doc;
2. *FALL:* the aftermath of the blizzard, Robert Wright's stroke and early stage of rehabilitation;
3. *STAND:* prolonged depiction of speech therapy, family interactions and identity reconstruction.

This novel matches to the study's goals. Its tripartite structure explicitly demonstrates three types of survival: physical, physiological, and psychological. It gives an opportunity to conduct a controlled comparative analysis of narrative strategies, linguistic and stylistic features across distinct dramatic contexts.

To achieve the objectives, a linguo-stylistic analysis based on Leech and Short's heuristic checklist (2007) is applied. It integrates the following parts:

1. Lexical analysis (semantic fields, modality, evaluative language) to study thematic clusters of survival vocabulary;
2. Grammatical and syntactic analysis (sentence types, clause structures, parataxis vs. hypotaxis) to research rhythmic effects;
3. Figurative language analysis (metaphor, simile, personification) to explore the symbolic dimension of elemental threats;
4. Cohesion and discourse analysis (pronoun reference, temporal anchoring, cohesion devices) to describe focalisation and narrative flow.

This multilateral approach ensures that we examine properly both micro-level features (words, sounds) and macro-level structures (narrative sequence, perspective shifts). The heuristic checklist provides a systematic framework. In addition, the qualitative close reading leads to interpretive depth. Given the novel's deliberate stylistic deviations (fragmentation, polyphony, temporal flexibility), linguo-stylistic analysis is not only appropriate. It is necessary to show how narrative form performs survival.

1. Theoretical background

Narrative perspective is one of the most important concepts in fiction. L. Tahiri, W. Huemer, S. Ehrlich, K. Indriyanto, J. Igartua, I. Guerrero-Martín, A. Heiniger, C. Hoffmann, G. Gayret, A. Bruns, T. Köppe, N. Bekhta, A. Bazzoni, A. De Graaf and many others have already researched the topic of narrative perspective.

Recent scholarship demonstrates that narrative voice and perspective are multilateral tools. Authors use them to achieve several goals. For instance, they are used to immerse readers into the story. Another point is that narrative perspective can offer moral guidance. Finally, it may be used to add complexity to fictional topics. Both qualitative and quantitative approaches show how narratorial comments influence the plot and its perception (Heiniger, 2023, p. 340). Interdisciplinary overviews lead to understanding that "voice" is located at the intersection of mind-style and viewpoint (Hoffmann, 2017, pp. 162–163). Stylistic studies show how free indirect discourse employs specific lexical patterns. It is thought to be used to convey character consciousness (Gayret, 2016, pp. 22–23). Work on focalisation shows how texts reflect a character's sensory and cognitive viewpoint. It is meant to immerse readers in so-called diegetic perception (Bruhns & Köppe, 2024, p. 129). Direct address and other collective and second-person narratives, such as "we-narratives", are effective strategies. They catalyse the development of collective ethics and strengthen bonds between the reader and the narrator (Bekhta, 2021, pp. 12–14; Bazzoni, 2024, pp. 389–390).

According to Tahiri (2020), narrative perspective is a fundamental concept in literature. It involves the selection of a specific point of view (p. 203). From it, the events of a story are portrayed. It includes various ways in which a narrative can be structured and presented to the reader. This influences how characters, events and themes are perceived within the text. Tahiri emphasises the significance of differentiating between internal perspectives (character's perspective) and external perspectives (narrator's perspective). It is done to understand how the narrative voice is made. When a specific narrative perspective is adopted, authors convey the emotions, thoughts and experiences of characters. They control how information flows and how readers engage with the text.

Huemer (2022) offers a detailed look at how narrative fiction uses various perspectives to share meaning and deepen understanding (p. 164). He begins by addressing the anti-cognitivist challenge. The researcher asks how stories can help us learn about the world. The anti-cognitivist view sees fiction mainly as a way to enjoy beauty. It is not seen as a tool for sharing truth or knowledge. This perspective claims that fiction's descriptions are not true. Thus, it cannot contribute to our understanding of reality in a direct way. Huemer (2022) outlines two key ideas about narrative perspective: subjective experience and representational technique (p. 177).

Subjective experience shows how fiction reveals different views of the world. It involves the following: imagination and empathy, subjective character of experience and nature of subjectivity. Imagination and empathy encourage readers to imagine the world from the perspective of characters while subjective character of experience gives readers an opportunity to imagine the world from the perspective of characters; the nature of subjectivity examines how people's distinct viewpoints influence their experiences and interpretations of the world.

Representational technique sees perspective as a way to show reality. This is similar to how linear perspective in Renaissance painting helped show three-dimensional space on a flat surface. Its key points include: rule-guided representation (perspective as a representational technique involves following specific rules or methods to depict scenes and events), linear perspective and fiction (narrative techniques in fiction allow for the exploration and representation of various viewpoints) and imaginative engagement (by employing these techniques, fiction invites readers to engage in imaginative exercises that give them an opportunity to understand different perspectives).

Ehrlich (2014) questions the usual separation of foreground and background in narratives (p. 106). It is done particularly in texts with many viewpoints. Ehrlich argues this simple divide does not fully capture the complex views in modernist literature. She suggests that we should see narratives as containing foreground and background material which are represented from various viewpoints. Each contributes uniquely to the narrative.

Ehrlich (2014) makes her conclusions from analysing extended text excerpts to show how cohesion, coherence, referential linking, semantic connector linking and temporal linking function above the sentence level (p. 95). She shows how cohesive and coherent devices and temporal markers work together. They shape the point of view and narrative structure. The linguistic clues highlight the interdependence of linguistic form and literary style. Thus are integral to readers' interpretations of narrative perspectives.

Ehrlich (2014) highlights the key role of linguistic clues. They help us identify and understand point of view in literary narratives (p. 1). Her study shows how linguistic form, cohesion and coherence connect. It also looks at how these factors shape the understanding of point of view in texts with complex timelines. At the same time, she argues that reference to discourse properties of texts is essential for a proper research of point of view. The analysis demonstrates that point of view interpretations in literary narratives provide a natural intersection for the disciplines of linguistics and literary studies. Ehrlich focuses on formal linguistic properties. She aims to explain readers' interpretations of point of view in texts rather than offering new readings of the texts themselves.

In doing so, Ehrlich (2014) revisits the significance of cohesion and coherence in creating a unified narrative (p. 27). She emphasises the importance of cohesive devices like pronouns, conjunctions and semantic connectors in connecting sentences and larger discourse units. The text is interpreted as a coherent whole due to the parts. They guide the reader through shifts in viewpoint and maintain the narrative's continuity. The relationship between cohesion and coherence has a significant impact on how readers perceive and understand different points of view within a text.

Temporal linking is highlighted by the researcher. She accomplishes this by employing anchoring predicates and temporal expressions. They are crucial tools for chronologically ordering narrative events. Understanding how changes

in time and perspective are depicted in the narrative depends on this temporal structure. Referential linking maintains the connection between various textual elements. This improves the quality of story's clarity and flow. Pronouns and reference chains are used to make it function.

The question of use of a verb tense, such as the progressive and simple tenses, is important to her. According to Ehrlich (2014), it is important in interpreting point of view (p. 87). Temporal distinctions influence how readers perceive and understand narrative events. This contributes to the portrayal of different perspectives within the text. These tenses help readers to realise the narrative's temporal flow and the characters' viewpoints. They also add depth to the narrative's structure.

Another researcher of narrative voice is K. Indriyanto. He claims that the use of many voices and perspectives (polyvocal narration) enriches the narrative (Indriyanto, 2022, p. 87). It provides a more complete and multilateral view of characters and events. Using narrative voice well helps to create an immersive world within a story. Detailed sensory descriptions and different perspectives bring the story to life. As a result, readers can mentally simulate the experiences of characters. This boosts their interest and helps them to grasp the story's emotional and cultural background. The narrative voice is used as a guide for readers to construct mental models of the fictional world. It makes them to experience the story in a more profound way. This process is crucial for fostering an environmental imagination. This kind of imagination connects readers with the physical and cultural spaces described in the narrative. At the same time, narrative voice provides textual cues. They guide the reader's perception and interpretation of the story. These cues include shifts in language, sensory details and changes in narrative perspective. They help to influence the reader's engagement with the world within a story.

De Graaf (2022) highlights the importance of narrative voice in creating an emotional engagement (p. 172). A first-person perspective enhances identification. However, third-person narratives can still be engaging. They can provide access to the characters' inner worlds. In addition, reader similarity plays a vital role in self-referencing. Therefore, a successful persuasion in narratives depends on both perspective and relatable content.

De Graaf (2022) explores how narrative perspective affects a reader's connection to the protagonist (p. 166). She also looks at how this influences self-referencing. This term covers the situation when readers relate the story to their own experiences. She contrasts two narrative perspectives: first-person perspective *(«I had planned the appointment…»*) and third-person perspective *(«Sara had planned the appointment…»*).

On the one hand, De Graaf (2022) finds that the first-person perspective significantly increases identification with the protagonist (p. 165).This happens because it gives a direct access to the character's thoughts, emotions and subjective experiences. It also creates a sense of intimacy between the reader and

the character. On the other hand, the third-person perspective creates a more distanced viewpoint. In this way, identification becomes weaker.

De Graaf (2022) states that internal thoughts are the key for boosting identification, no matter the perspective (p. 174). Even in third-person perspective, if the text shows the protagonist's thoughts through free indirect speech, readers can still connect deeply to them.

Despite this, self-referencing is not as dependent on perspective alone, even if identification is strongly influenced on by narrative perspective. Instead, reader-protagonist similarity (age, profession, experiences) has a greater impact on how much a reader relates the story to their own life.

De Graaf (2022) suggests that narrative voice alone is not enough to make readers personally relate to a story (p. 164). It must also include elements that mirror their own experiences.

It is discussed by Chen et al. (2024) how narrative perspective, specifically the choice between first-person and third-person viewpoints, significantly influences consumers' emotional engagement and attitudes to a brand. Researchers also study how these effects can vary depending on the product's level of involvement (p. 1). The first-person view is rather helpful for cultivating positive feelings for a certain brand. This is especially true for products that are important to consumers.

According to Chen et al. (2024), narrative perspective is the viewpoint from which a story is told (p. 2). It has an enormous influence on how consumers see the plot and characters. The researchers claim that it affects psychological and emotional engagement. It, in its turn, impacts consumers' experience and attitudes for a certain brand.

Chen et al. (2024) differentiate two types of narrative perspective (p. 2). They are first-person and third-person. In first-person perspective, a character who is situated within it (the protagonist) narrates the story. This type of perspective involves the use of pronouns like "I". This cultivates connection and intimacy with the audience. This perspective opens new possibilities for deep insight into the narrator's thoughts and emotions. In third-person perspective, there is an external narrator who is not a character in the story. They also retell the plot using pronouns like "he" or "she." This viewpoint offers a more detached narrative. Therefore, it may limit the emotional connection with the audience.

Chen et al. (2024) identify two primary mechanisms through which narrative perspective affects brand attitudes: social presence and self-brand connection (p. 2). Social presence refers to the sense of being with other people through the narrative. A first-person perspective often enhances this feeling. This leads to better comprehension and receptivity. As for the self-brand connection, consumers may feel a stronger connection to a brand through the protagonist's experiences. A first-person narrative can lead consumers to embrace the protagonist's attributes into their own self-image. This cultivates a more positive attitude toward a brand.

Chen et al. (2024) concluded that the first-person narrative perspective tends to provoke more positive brand attitudes unlike the third-person narratives (p. 9). This happens due to a greater emphasis on emotional engagement and reflexive processing of the information presented.

To prove the point, Chen et al. (2024) conducted three experiments involving 526 participants (p. 1). They consistently validated the hypotheses related to narrative perspective, social presence, self-brand connection and the moderating effect of product involvement.

The concept of narrative voice influencing how effectively a personal story can persuade an audience is central in the study by Igartua and Guerrero-Martín (2022, p. 22). The researchers explore the role of narrative voice in enhancing identification with the protagonist. They also study the impact it has on audience's attitudes. Narrative voice refers to the perspective from which the author tells a story. It is typically classified into first-person, second-person, and third-person perspectives. The choice of narrative voice is a vital formal feature that affects how the story is perceived by the audience. The narrator is a part of the story and shares their experiences directly with the audience in the first-person perspective. This perspective makes a deeper connection with the protagonist possible. It provides direct access to their thoughts and feelings. In the third-person perspective, the narrator is situated outside of the story. They describe the protagonist's experiences from an observer's viewpoint. As a result, this creates a psychological distance between the audience and the protagonist. In the second-person perspective, the reader is addressed directly as "you". However, this type of perspective is only used in social or health campaigns, which is rare.

Igartua and Guerrero-Martín (2022, p. 23), similarly to De Graaf (2022, p. 166), Chen et al. (2024, p. 9) and some other researchers, hypothesise that first-person narratives are more effective in increasing identification with the protagonist in comparison to third-person narratives. Stories told from the first-person perspective help the audience to dive deeper into the main character's viewpoint.

The support for the idea that similarity to the protagonist increased identification only in the first-person narrative condition is provided by the study's experiment. Despite this, the third-person perspective did not significantly influence identification. The interaction effect showed that using a first-person narrative with high similarity made people feel closer to the protagonist. This, in its turn, enhanced cognitive elaboration and positive attitudes towards immigration.

The study argues that first-person narratives allow the audience to "merge" with the protagonist. This reduces psychological resistance and makes cognitive and emotional engagement easier. This merging process enhances the audience's cognitive elaboration. It makes them more likely to think deeply about the story and may change their attitudes.

Jin and Liu (2024) argue that narrative perspective is vital for understanding and engaging with narratives (p. 2). They think that shifts in this perspective significantly impact readers' cognitive processes and their ability to form coherent mental representations of the story.

Jin and Liu (2024) mention that narrative perspective serves as a fundamental linguistic component (p. 3). It dictates how a story is told to readers. It plays a role of a virtual "window" through which readers perceive events and observe the narrative progression. Perspective makes readers to engage with characters and their experiences.

Jin and Liu (2024) distinguish internal and external perspectives (p. 3). On the one hand, internal perspectives (first-person "I/we" or second-person "you") make readers to experience the story through a character's thoughts and feelings. They enhance engagement and comprehension. On the other hand, external perspectives (third-person "he/she/they") provide an observer's view.

In addition, Jin and Liu (2024) support the existence of two types of perspective shifts (p. 3). The first one is the shift between internal and external perspectives. For instance, *«"I'll (internal perspective) go for a video game after the dishes are done," Tom* (external perspective) *murmurs to himself while doing the dishes in the kitchen»*. In this case, the first clause uses a third-person external viewpoint to describe Tom's washing activity. The second clause switches to a first-person internal viewpoint. It expresses Tom's conscious thought. In this way, the author controls the internal-external perspective shift by employing direct speech. The internal-external perspective shifts when direct speech is suddenly used in a third-person external narration. Despite this, indirect speech keeps the original third-person external perspective.

The second kind of a shift is the inter-role perspective shift. It is the change between two characters. Even if the author tells the story entirely in the third-person external perspective, there may still be an inter-role perspective shift. For instance, *«Tom* (from Tom's point of view) *is in the kitchen doing the dishes when his mother enters* (from the point of view of Tom's mother)*.»* Both Tom's and his mother's actions are described from a third-person external perspective (as opposed to being consistent with Tom's perspective). However, the verb "go" (as opposed to "come") would cause readers' perspective to change from Tom to his mother in this case.

Brown (2024) defines narrative perspective as the angle from which a story is told (p. 1). It influences how events, characters and settings are perceived by the reader. It is a method employed by the author to present the narrative through a certain narrator. According to this idea, understanding the point of view is vital. It shapes the reader's experience and interpretation of the story.

The theory of narrative perspective includes two key concepts. They are narrative and narrative techniques. Narrative is defined as a report of events told by a narrator. The term covers all forms of storytelling including epics, novels, novelettes and short stories. At the same time, narrative techniques are used as the

methods and devices used to create a story. This can involve plot, style, character, theme, genre and, importantly, point of view.

Brown (2024) distinguishes several types of narrative perspective: first-person, second-person, third-person limited and third-person omniscient (p. 5). In the first-person perspective, the narrator is a character within the story. They use "I" or "we". This perspective provides a direct insight into the narrator's thoughts and feelings, making it more intimate. The second-person perspective uses the pronoun "you". It directly addresses the reader. It can create a unique and engaging reading experience, even though it is less commonly used. In the third-person limited perspective the narrator knows the thoughts and feelings of one character. This provides a focused perspective. Also, it maintains some narrative distance. In the third-person omniscient perspective, the narrator knows everything about all characters and events and presents them. This gives a broad view of the narrative situation.

According to Brown (2024), point of view determines how the reader interacts with the story (p. 8). It can create emotional distance or closeness and affects the reliability of the narrative. The narrator presents material signs (written words and imagery) that influence the thematic and emotional layers of the story.

Sabur and Sari (2021) conducted research to identify the narrator and focalisation structures of the novel *You: A Novel* by Caroline Kepnes (p. 60). They came to the conclusion that narrative perspective is the fundamental mechanism in fiction. By it, a story shapes a reader's understanding and emotional orientation. At the heart of this system is believed to be the narrator, the "who" of the storytelling. They can occupy positions both outside and inside the narrated world. An external or heterodiegetic narrator stands apart from the events they report about. On the one hand, this offers an apparent advantageous point of view. On the other hand, a character-bound or homodiegetic narrator lives themself in the story. When this narrator is also the protagonist, that is, an autodiegetic narrator, their testimonial function merges with their narrative function. They not only retell actions but also give an interpretation of them, colouring events with their own personal convictions and guiding reader judgment through their own ideological lens.

Closely linked to narrator positioning is focalisation, in other words, the question of "who perceives?" Within Genette's (1980) framework, zero or omniscient focalisation grants the narrator knowledge that surpasses any one character's. This gives and opportunity for a free movement across time, space, and consciousness (Marchand, n.d.). By contrast, internal focalisation confines the narrative's knowledge to that of a particular character. This immerses the reader into a single subjective field of perception. External focalisation limits the narrator strictly to observable behavior. It does not describe inner thoughts and emotions. Thus, it creates a detached and externally focused view of events. Both perceptible focalisation (sensory details such as sights and sounds) and non-

perceptible focalisation (the domain of thoughts and feelings) are orchestrated by the chosen focaliser. They control what the reader sees, hears and understands.

Finally, narrative voice emerges from the interaction of narrator role and focalisation choices. It is realised through stylistic strategies: syntactic patterns, pronoun usage, modality and descriptive detail. First-person narration, for example, invites a close and empathetic bond between reader and teller. Moreover, rich sensory immersion deepens emotional engagement. By selectively emphasising certain elements, such as a protagonist's losses over their transgressions, a narrative voice can trigger sympathy for morally complex characters. For instance, it can lead readers to sympathise with morally ambiguous antiheroes.

In the study by Kaiser (2015) of perspective-sensitive expressions, epithets, predicates of taste, epistemic modals and appositives, a central theoretical device is the idea of an epistemic anchor or judge parameter (p. 347). It determines whose attitudes or judgments a certain expression conveys. Lasersohn's judge-parameter framework (2005) was extended to expressives and modals by Potts (2007) and Stephenson (2008) and to epithets by Patel-Grosz (2012). It formalises the intuition that sentences like «*Surfing is fun*» or «*That jerk forgot*» are true only relative to some individual *j*, that is, the judge.

Prior semantic analyses largely assumed a default speaker orientation is normally the speaker themself. However, psycholinguistic work by Harris & Potts (2009) has shown that non-speaker-oriented readings are possible in context. Kaiser's replication and extension experiments confirm that although epithets and appositives exhibit a speaker-orientation bias, appropriate pragmatic cues can make readers assign the judge role to other participants (the sentence subject).

Crucially, Kaiser connects judge-shifting with free indirect discourse. Below it is referred as FID. It is a specific narrative mode. In it a character's thoughts are written without using a form of quotation. In FID indexicals and tenses remain aligned to the narrator. Nevertheless, evaluative language and epistemic adverbials («*that idiot*», «*probably*») act as triggers for readers. They shift perspective into the character's point of view. Such elements are believed to serve as signals. They make it clear that the embedded evaluation belongs to the character's mental stance rather than the narrator's.

Empirical results show that minimal pairs differing only by the presence of an epithet or epistemic adverb lead readers to interpret later pronouns and clauses as reflecting a character-centered rather than a narrator-centered perspective. These are the effects that standard pronoun-resolution theories which posit a general subject-preference cannot predict. This highlights the importance of context-sensitive mechanisms in both semantic theory and real-time comprehension. In non-fictional or conversational settings, the speaker remains the default judge. However, in literary-narrative contexts, FID cues license non-speaker judges. Also, they reshape focalisation accordingly.

The study by Salem et al. (2017) explores how four narrative modes, free indirect discourse (FID), psycho-narration, first-person narration and external focalisation, affect readers' perspective-taking along three dimensions: general relatedness to the protagonist, spatial viewpoint in mental imagery and psychological identification.

Their key findings are that both psycho-narration and first-person narration significantly increase readers' sense of "being in the protagonist's shoes". It is measured by an adapted Inclusion of Other in the Self scale and by spatial-perspective diagrams. At the same time, FID shows no reliable effect compared to an externally focalised account. Psychological identification (feeling one's thoughts and emotions align with the protagonist's) likewise trends highest under first-person narration. Then dispositional empathy, thematic interest and attentiveness are accounted for.

Providing direct access to a character's inner life via psycho-narration or first-person voice more powerfully drives reader perspective-taking than FID. This suggests that the subtler "blend" of narrator and character consciousness in FID may not suffice to shift readers' mental standpoint as robustly.

Kim et al. (2019) claim that first-person narration boosts social presence more than third-person narration (p. 1). Across two experiments conducted by them, simply shifting from "he/she" to "I" made readers feel a stronger sense of "being together" with the story's protagonist.

In Study 1 ($N = 503$), increases in social presence drove the effect of first-person perspective on supportive attitudes towards outgroup policies. Identification did not differ. Transportation was not assessed there either.

In Study 2 ($N = 410$), social presence again mediated first-person effects on both policy attitudes and behavioral intentions, although identification only mediated when the protagonist was ingroup (not outgroup) and transportation remained unaffected by perspective.

The first-person advantage in social presence emerged equally for stories about an outgroup migrant worker and an ingroup student. While first-person narration increased identification with an ingroup protagonist, it did not boost identification with an outgroup protagonist.

However, it is important to note that the study states the fact that contradicts some of the other researches: neither first- nor third-person narration differed in how immersed readers felt in the story world.

Siegenthaler and Fahr (2023) support the idea mentioned above with their findings (p. 35). Contrary to expectations, using a first-person versus third-person narrative voice did not increase identification with the character.

Despite this, there are still researchers who claim the opposite. According to Chaudhary (2024), narrative voice is far more than a neutral way to tell a plot (p. 17). It actively shapes how readers engage with, interpret and inhabit a story world. By selecting a particular grammatical "person", focaliser or polyphonic structure, authors guide readers' emotional proximity to characters, the amount of

contextual information they receive and even the cognitive work required to construct meaning.

When a story is told in first-person, the narrator addresses the reader as “I”. They invite them directly into the protagonist’s inner life. This choice creates a sense of immediacy and authenticity: readers overhear unfiltered thoughts, feel the narrator’s emotional highs and lows and often lose track of their own self-awareness in the process.

By contrast, an omniscient third-person narrator stands at a slight distance. This offers a broader, more panoramic view of characters and events. This distance can lend a sense of authority and balance. This gives readers an opportunity to weigh many characters’ motivations without being “inside” any one’s mind.

In her study, Maier (2015) investigates free indirect discourse and makes the assumption that FID blends features of direct and indirect discourse (p. 346). It reports a character’s thoughts or speech without an explicit framing clause (the “free” aspect). Despite this, it adjusts pronouns and tenses to the narrator’s context (the “indirect” aspect).

She identifies four hallmark properties of FID. The first is the reported thought/speech aspect. It means that FID conveys what a character thinks or says.

Another point is that free indirect discourse is free from frames. It lacks obligatory “she thought” or “he said” phrases. Despite this, parenthetical frames are possible.

Moreover, unlike verbatim quotes, FID systematically shifts pronouns and tenses. For instance, “tomorrow was” instead of “tomorrow is”.

Finally, free indirect discourse retains indexicals (“here”, “today”), expressive vocabulary, fragmentary syntax, and dialect features. In short, exactly as the character would use them.

Hoffmann (2017) argues that narrative voice contains both “perspective” (the narrator’s vantage) and “mind-style” (the linguistic reflection of a character’s consciousness) (pp. 159–160). This offers a comprehensive framework for analysing how authors mediate between character and reader. Taking these points to consideration, Heiniger’s mixed-method study of *Jómsvíkinga saga* demonstrates that even brief narratorial comments function as metanarrative markers. They guide plot and encouraging reader to reflect on the act of storytelling itself (Heiniger, 2023, pp. 332–334).

In her corpus analysis of *Women in Love*, Gayret (2016) identifies six principal lexical strategies, clause-initial adjuncts, interjections, sentence modifiers, epistemic lexemes, intensifiers and foreign borrowings (pp. 17–19). They enable authors to “slip into” a character’s voice without excessive first-person framing. She shows that this lexical kit balances narrative distance and psychological immediacy. It does it by embedding thought-markers seamlessly within the third-person narration (Gayret, 2016, p. 24).

Bruhns and Köppe (2024) define internal focalisation as “the imaginative act of perceiving through a character’s viewpoint” (pp. 127–129). This shows that narratives organise sensory detail and cognitive inference around a focal consciousness. It is done to draw readers into the story world. Their study distinguishes this mechanism from free indirect discourse. It is done by emphasising the selective filtering of perception inherent in focalised narration.

Bracke (2019) examines contemporary flood novels (pp. 325–327). He argues that shifting focalisation can mobilise reader empathy for collective subjects. This means that narrative perspective has a common ground with ecological and social ethics. Bekhta’s (2020) monograph on we-narratives argues that plural narration (“we”) formalises collective identity and compels readers (pp. 12–14). The goal is to negotiate between individual and communal voices. Bazzoni (2024) analyses second-person narration in Italian fiction (pp. 389–390). She shows how direct address cultivates connections. In addition, she shows how an ethical bond exists between the narrator and the implied reader.

Gregoriou (2023) studies suspense in Sophie Hannah’s *The Other Half Lives* (pp. 45–47). He shows that it relies on strategic shifts in narrative perspective. They manipulate reader expectations and frame repair. Breger (2018) looks at polyphonic narration in Zadie Smith’s writing (pp. 86–88). He shows how different voices create a cosmopolitan ethics of storytelling. The researcher emphasises the relational interplay among narrative agents.

Authors working across versions and genres illustrate the flexible nature of narrative voice. Hilfling (2024) shows how genetic versions of texts reveal shifts in voice that reflect changes in authorial intent (pp. 55–57). Aćamović (2019) explores postmodern epic forms in Atwood and Barth (pp. 44–46). He shows how intertextual play changes narratorial authority. Dubi’s (2020) case study of Bonnie Winn's Protected Hearts shows how a first-person voice triggers reader’s empathy (p. 1). It does this by changing tense and modality in certain ways. Naz, Qasim, and Umar (2025) use close narrative analysis to show how Najdi’s short stories weave spatial and temporal perspectives to frame cultural memory (p. 2). Xu and Zhong (2022) reveal feminist narratological strategies in *To the Lighthouse* (pp. 2068–2070). They highlight a strong female authorial voice.

Studies of tense and boundary-crossing fiction reveal further innovations. Ikeo (2022) argues that present-tense narratives break time rules (p. 5). They create immediacy and surprise readers. Maxey (2016) shows how national identity appears in voice (pp. 210–212). This happens through changes between collective and individual views in Joshua Ferris’s novels. Farinde and Oyedokun-Alli (2021) explore the complex voice structure in Omotoso’s *The Edifice* (pp. 102–104). They show how code-switching and narrative layering express postcolonial subjectivity.

Murayama’s fiction, as analysed by Indriyanto et al. (2023), blends first-person thoughts with third-person stories (p. 3). It forms a layered view of Japanese-American life in Hawaii. This technique matches broader ideas about

spatial perspective. Here, geography acts as a key part of the narrative (de Certeau, 1984, p. 117). The authors distinguish internal and external focus. This brings out personal memories and shared history. The method is also relevant in contemporary film studies of Hawai'i (Auer, 2007, pp. 22–23).

Velu and Rajasekaran (2024) place Mbue's story in a line of environmental fictions (p. 5). These works use collective narration to provoke reader's empathy. The we-narrator in *How Beautiful We Were* highlights shared trauma and resistance. This mirrors findings in ecological activism studies. These studies show that multiple voices can reveal overlooked views in climate justice stories (Siemes, 2023, p. 2). Empirical work on narrative adaptation even suggests that shared voice increases readers' pro-environmental attitudes (Green & Brock, 2000, p. 703).

Rautela (2021) shows that Indian novelists use heterodiegetic narration and free indirect discourse (p. 45). They do this to critique caste oppression. This reflects findings in South Asian literary studies. Here, the narrative perspective is a point of conflict for social identities (Urvashi Butalia, 2019, p. 88).

Thus, the idea that the concepts of narrative perspective, point of view and narrative voice are essential parts of fiction is supported by the studies.

2. Research methods

The study involves the linguo-stylistic analysis of verbalisation of fighting for live in J. McGregor's *Lean, Fall, Stand.* It is expressed by narrative perspective, linguistic and stylistic features. The analysis uses the following heuristic checklist of linguistic and stylistic categories presented by Leech and Short (2007, p. 60).

While it cannot be fully exhaustive, it offers categories that, based on Leech and Short's (2007, p. 61) study, are likely to reveal stylistically relevant information. The categories are organized into four main groups. They are: lexical categories, grammatical categories, figures of speech, and cohesion and context. For instance, we use lexical categories to explore how word choices convey different types of meaning. Since the list is meant to be a heuristic tool, mixing categories in this way is not an issue. It is also natural that categories may overlap. The same feature might be noted under different headings.

2.1. Lexical category

The text creates a register that is at once familiar and precise. It moves freely between plainspoken narration, colloquial dialogue and clusters of specialised terminology. The dialogue frequently employs everyday intensifiers and swearing. Therefore, it conveys immediacy and character: *«Is five, fucking, sorry. Is five hundred miles, is it?»* The landscape descriptions and domestic scenes are built almost entirely from high-frequency, that is, simple words: *«Frost capped the ploughed ridges.»* and *«Low clouds streaked towards the horizon.»* The author evokes setting with straightforward lexis.

However, this visible simplicity is emphasised by multi-syllabic and domain-specific terms every time the narrative turns to the Antarctic fieldwork: *«belay», «crampon», «drybag», «flashgun», «jerrycan»*. The words appear in a single inventory list. The technical precision of the survey activities is highlighted by references to *«GPS base units»* and *«VHF repeater unit»*. These words are unambiguously referential. They are chosen for their accuracy rather than any emotive resonance.

Formality shifts sharply with context. The third-person narration and scene-setting feel measured and descriptive (*«They loaded more equipment than they needed, and carried food and shelter in case they were caught out…»*). The characters' speech is colloquial and full of idioms: *«pardon my French»* enters in conversation about camp hygiene and the simple collocations *«streaked towards», «ploughed ridges»* or *«roaring wind»* belong to a standard British English register.

Although primarily descriptive, occasional evaluative language appears when characters reflect on their experiences. For example, Anna thinks about being alone: *«…sounded glamorous. Heroic, on both their parts…»* The repetition of expletives (*«Christ! Obviously, obviously.»*) emphasises frustration or astonishment in dialogue depending on the context.

The vocabulary covers both general and highly specific semantic fields. The author describes domestic life with words like *«kitchen», «chairs», «post»,* and *«tea»*. Medical and rehabilitation settings appear through *«speech therapist», «communication strategies»*, and exercises to recall *«walk, sun, red»*. Polar-field operations are named by *«field hut», «skiway», «skidoo», «fuel drums»* and *«groomers»*. Rare or specialised vocabulary (*«jerrycan», «crampon», «GPS base units», «anthropogenic climate impacts»*) signals professional and scientific domains.

Morphologically, compound nouns are plentiful: *«drybag», «kitbag», «skiway», «flashgun», «oil-fired stove»*. They knit together two concrete referents into a single unit. Verbal forms often appear in their participial or gerund form (*«ploughed», «streaked», «running», «calibrating»*). This builds vivid, ongoing scenes while repetitions *(«And, and, and.»*). Gibberish speech rhythms in dialogue foreground the characters' emotional states rather than their referential content.

Finally, the author leans on referential rather than purely emotive lexis. Strong feelings are conveyed through context, rhythm and repetition rather than plenty of inherently loaded adjectives. For example, there is a scene where Anna watches the group's applause. The emotion arises from the situation as much as from the words themselves: *«She mostly felt a great sadness. It was the kind of sadness that felt oddly appropriate.»*

The text's vocabulary is a deliberate blend of both simple, descriptive language and highly specific technical terms. Its register alternates between neutral narration and colloquial speech. It relies on both morphological

compounds and field-specific jargon to root the story in domestic, clinical and Antarctic environments.

The prose of the text mostly describes the world perceived by senses. Most of its nouns are concrete. They describe physical objects and landscapes: *«field hut», «skidoo», «fuel drums», «oil-fired stove», «ridges», «canvas straps»* populate the Antarctic scenes. Domestic life is evoked by *«kitchen», «cups», «chairs», «vegetable beds», «mulch», «fruit cages»*. These concrete nouns are meant to ground the reader in place and material reality.

To express inner states, perceptions, unfolding processes and social qualities, the text makes frequent use of abstract nouns. Words reflecting emotions such as *«sadness», «excitement», «satisfaction», «relief»* and *«frustration»* appear when characters reflect on their experiences: *«She realised that she was supposed to feel excitement and satisfaction. She mostly felt a great sadness.»* Perceptual and sensory abstractions like *«silence», «noise», «permission»* and *«thrill»* give texture to moments of stillness or communal response: *«There was quiet, and then some clapping … the noise almost like a roaring wind.»* Social qualities and events like *«group», «conversation», «applause», «sharing»* and *«performance»* frame communal activities, whether in the hut or a speech-therapy exercise: *«...a general outbreak of conversation.»*

Vital anchoring work is performed by proper names in the text. Personal names such as Robert, Anna, Sara, Luke, Mary, Amira, Pauline, Bridget, Raymond, Thomas, Gavin and others mark shifting points of view. Another point is that they maintain clarity of who is thinking or speaking. Place-names such as Garrard Ridge, Priestley Head, Station K, Cambridge and Peninsula locate each scene precisely in the polar survey context. Institutional titles (*«the Institute», «Friends Meeting House»*) similarly situate characters within social and organisational structures.

Collective nouns emphasise the communal dimension of both exploration and rehabilitation. For instance, words like *«group», «people», «conversation», «applause» «shouting»* and *«singing»* shift attention from individuals to shared activity, whether it's the field team celebrating a skiway cleared or patients in therapy responding together: *«The group's activities are designed to encourage.»* This interplay between the concrete and the abstract and between the individual and the collective, is meant to shape a narrative that is both vividly material and richly human.

Adjectives are used with moderate frequency throughout the text. Especially they are present in its descriptive passages. There they richly specify the material and sensory world and most are used attributively, that is, directly before nouns: *«Frost capped the ploughed ridges.», «Low clouds streaked towards the horizon.»* But there are also clear instances of predicative use, where the adjective follows a linking verb: *«Conditions were excellent, and it wasn't far.»; «It was a poorly supported decision.»*

Physical attributes are common: *«heavy canvas straps»*, *«shallow ripples»*, *«slippery scree»*. There is a variety of visual adjectives: *«dark grey waters»*, *«faint orange light»*. Colour terms are often non-gradable and purely descriptive (*«red field hut»*, *«blue aeroplane»*). Auditory adjectives appear when they evoke sound: *«roaring wind»* and *«roaring oil-fired stove»*. Emotive qualifiers like *«great sadness»* introduce an affective layer. The author rarely uses evaluative adjectives (*«excellent»*, *«reasonable»*) to pass judgment on actions or situations.

Most adjectives are gradable: *«low»*, *«faint»*, *«heavy»*, *«poorly supported»*. They can all take comparative or superlative forms. Pure colour terms and certain absolute descriptors serve a non-gradable and categorical role. Restrictiveness generally follows meaning. On one hand, adjectives that narrow down reference are restrictive (*«the faint orange light»* specifies which light). On the other hand, some non-restrictive adjectives simply add commentary without altering the noun's core identity (*«Conditions were excellent»*).

The text employs a balanced mix of attributive and predicative adjectives. They are mostly gradable and richly varied across physical, visual, auditory, colour, emotive and evaluative domains.

Verbs in the text play a significant role. They not only drive the plot of polar exploration but also map characters' shifting inner worlds and the hushed processes of the Antarctic environment. Throughout the narrative, dynamic verbs dominate action scenes propels the team into motion: *«They loaded more equipment than they needed, and carried food and shelter…».* Descriptions of movement (*«They travelled by skidoo as far as possible, hauling the equipment on foot…»*) and environmental change (*«Water vapour froze in the air and crystallised and the snow settled slowly.»*) create an internal sense of place. Speech acts are likewise highlighted in dialogue. For example, Luke's terse warning, *«"Don't fucking panic…"»* snaps urgency into the scene.

Nevertheless, stative verbs mark moments of reflection or perception. When Anna steps back to assess her feelings (*«She realised that she was supposed to feel excitement and satisfaction. She mostly felt a great sadness.»)* the stative verbs *«realised»* and *«felt»* reveal interior states. Hence, they presuppose their truth. Equally, simple existential constructions allow the reader to experience shared moments of stillness or communal celebration: *«There was quiet, and then some clapping…»*.

The text is further nuanced by grammatical patterns of transitivity and linking functions. Clear targets to physical and emotional actions are given by transitive verbs (*«They loaded…»*). Even so, intransitives (*«Time passed.»; «The wind dropped for a moment…»*) evoke open-ended processes. Linking verbs provide moments of evaluation or commentary. They toggle between report and reflection: *«Conditions were excellent, and it wasn't far.»; «It was difficult to put into words.»*

Finally, the text balances factive verbs against non-factive verbs of thought and hope. They presuppose the certainty of their complements. This leaves room

for doubt: *«She realised…», «He knew…»* Through these varied verbal choices, dynamic and stative, transitive and intransitive, factive and non-factive, the writer shows both the perceivable resilience of the expedition team and the impermanent landscapes of human emotion.

Adverbs in the text appear with moderate frequency. They quietly shape both the pace of action and the tone of dialogue. Many serve manner functions. They clarify how things happen: Robert *«blinked at her quickly, opening and closing his mouth.»*

Temporal adverbs anchor the narrative in time: Bridget was *«already looking in Anna's cupboard for saucepans.»*; the dancers repeated movements *«again and again.»*; and moments are foreshortened with *«soon»*: *«Next, soon. In a little while?»*. Place and direction adverbs ground characters in space: Rachel *«stepped back, and closed the door securely»* inside, Anna *«stepped out into the corridor»* before stepping *«out»* again to feel *«the warm evening air pillowed in»*, and household chores shift *«downstairs»* while voices rise *«upstairs»*.

Degree adverbs intensify emotion and description: *«I'm very tired.»* Anna admits.

2.2. Grammatical category

The overwhelming majority of sentences in the text are declarative. They lay out setting, action and reflection in straightforward statements: *«They loaded more equipment than they needed, and carried food and shelter in case they were caught out»; «Frost capped the ploughed ridges»*.

The text includes questions that increase tension or show character doubt. In one scene, a character hesitates: *«Is five, fucking, sorry. Is five hundred miles, is it?»*

Commands appear primarily in dialogue to convey urgency or authority. Sometimes they are met in free indirect speech. When trouble looms, Luke snaps: *«Don't fucking panic.»*

The text includes exclamations that stand alone to show emotion or surprise: *«Christ!»*

Some minor sentence types, like verbless fragments and nominal phrases, imitate natural speech and inner thoughts. For instance, a character's hesitation and planning is captured in two brief fragments: *«Next, soon.»*

Each of these non-declarative forms plays a vital role. The questions draw readers into the characters' doubts, commands inject immediacy. Apart from this, exclamations convey raw feeling. Minor sentences reflect the halting and fragmented nature of spontaneous speech or thought.

The text mainly uses declarative sentences. They present actions, descriptions and reflections in clear statements. The author uses questions, commands, exclamations and fragments. This choice reflects natural speech and builds tension.

Alternatively, sentence structure leans towards the simple or mildly complex. A rough estimate of average sentence length is around from ten to fifteen words. To demonstrate, the compact *«Time passed.»* contrasts with a more extended narrative clause of about eighteen words: *«They loaded more equipment than they needed, and carried food and shelter in case they were caught out…»*

The ratio of dependent to independent clauses appears in low number. Perhaps, there is one dependent clause for every four or five independent clauses. Many sentences consist of a single main clause. It may be occasionally expanded by coordination rather than deep subordination. Complexity varies sharply:

1. Very simple/intransitive: *«Time passed.»*
2. Coordinated/compound (two or more independent clauses joined by "and" or "but"): *«They loaded more equipment than they needed, and carried food and shelter in case they were caught out…»*
3. Subordinated/complex (main + dependent introduced by "that", "when", etc.): *«She realised that she was supposed to feel excitement and satisfaction.»*
4. Paratactic/fragmented (speech-like fragments, no verb or loosely linked clauses): *«Next, soon.»*

Coordination is the primary source of complexity in narrative sentences. Conjunction "and" links equal clauses more often than subordinate clauses appear. Subordination appears most of the times in psychological reflections or technical descriptions: that "that"-clause above, or *«Water vapour froze in the air and crystallised and the snow settled slowly…»* where three participial constructions stack after a single subject-verb. Parataxis is particularly noticeable in dialogue. It captures halting speech rhythms: *«Is five, fucking, sorry. Is five hundred miles, is it?»*

As for where complexity tends to occur, it usually follows the verb. Extended adverbial or subordinate phrases often come at clause endings: *«…in case they were caught out…», «…and the snow settled slowly.»* There is little anticipatory front-loading of long dependent clauses before the main verb. Most dependent material follows the core clause. One exception is the existential "there"-start. It places the subject after the verb: *«There was quiet, and then some clapping …»* This anticipatory structure emphasises the event (*«quiet»*) before naming the experiencer.

The text's syntax favours declarative and moderately-sized sentences enriched by coordination, with subordinate clauses and paratactic fragments adding texture in reflection and dialogue. Sentence length and complexity differs from time to time to serve narrative pacing. Short and clipped utterances are present in speech. Longer and coordinated lines are present in description. Finally, occasional subordinate clauses are present in moments of introspection.

The author makes regular use of a variety of dependent-clause types. This means that relative clauses, adverbial clauses and nominal clauses are met in the

text. Numerous reduced (non-finite) clauses are used to pack limited amount of information. Nonetheless they vary rhythm and focus.

Relative clauses are frequently used to add identifying or descriptive detail to nouns: *«They chose unambiguous reference points for their readings: a VHF repeater unit that had been installed thirty years ago, and featured in successive aerial photographs…»* Here the that-clause restricts the noun to a specific, historically significant unit.

Time and condition adverbial clauses often set the stage for actions. They usually start with words like when or as. For example, fieldwork starts with *«When the weather was clear they trekked out from the field hut to take GPS readings.»* Later, it says: *«When they got to the reference point they worked efficiently…»* These details pinpoint the action and reflect the strict and weather-based routine of Antarctic surveying.

Nominal clauses appear both as that-clauses and wh-clauses:

1. That-clauses report characters' thoughts or speech with an assumed truth value: *«She realised that she was supposed to feel excitement and satisfaction.»*
2. Wh-clauses capture indirect questions or curiosity about future events: *«She asked him what would happen in the showing; what would he be doing?»*

McGregor widely uses reduced (non-finite) clauses to pack descriptive and procedural detail into compact phrases:

1. Infinitive clauses convey purpose: *«…trekked out from the field hut to take GPS readings.»*
2. -ing participial clauses often follow main verbs to describe simultaneous or resulting actions: *«…and carried food and shelter in case they were caught out, hauling the equipment on foot when the ground became too steep.»*
3. Verbless fragments capture hesitation or planning. This happens especially in dialogue or internal thought: *«Next, soon.»*

The text favours a mix of relative, adverbial and nominal dependent clauses. For this reason, it layers detail and viewpoint. Non-finite clauses and verbless fragments keep text dynamic. They are closely aligned with both procedural description and the spontaneous nature of dialogue.

The sentences in the text typically follow a straightforward subject-verb-object pattern, with transitive verbs: *«They loaded more equipment than they needed…»*; *«They carried food and shelter…»* They take direct objects that are often immediately followed by adverbial phrases of place, purpose or condition: *«…trekked out from the field hut to take GPS readings»; «…in case they were caught out and needed to lay up…»*. Intransitive verbs also occur frequently. They are more often accompanied by adverbials rather than objects. They cause moments of process or atmosphere to unfold without a direct patient: *«A storm moved through the valley.»*

Verbs of cognition and speech regularly take clause complements: *«She realised that she was supposed to feel excitement…»*. They anchor characters' inner states with that-clauses. Unusual front-loaded elements are believed to be mainly an initial adverbials for scene-setting: *«In the orange tent, a body breathed.»* and *«At the foot of Priestley Head, beside a damaged skidoo, a small orange tent was gradually submerged by the snow.»* Conversely, objects and complements almost always follow the verb. Hence, a clear subject-verb-object order is preserved.

The text also uses both existential "there" and preparatory "it" constructions to manage information flow. New situations often open with *«There was quiet, and then some clapping…»* or *«There were ripples on the water. The ice slipped and broke into the sea.»*, introducing phenomena before anchoring them in the scene. Evaluative or commentary sentences use "It was" fronting: *«It was a poorly supported decision.»*; *«It wasn't on a bus route, and it wasn't near a school.»* It is done to present judgments without specifying an explicit subject.

Noun phrases in the text range from the very simple to sophisticated elaborated structures. As a rule, they tend toward straightforward subject-verb-object patterns with complexity introduced mainly after the noun, rather than through heavy stacking of premodifiers.

Most noun phrases are simple or contain only light premodification: a single adjective or compound noun. For example, *«heavy canvas straps»* hold down the stranded hut and the beachside station is described as *«the red field hut of Station K»*. Even compound nouns like *«skiway»*, *«drybag»* or *«fuel drums»* present multiword ideas without deep embedding .

Where we do see postmodification, it often comes in the form of relative clauses or prepositional phrases tacked onto a simple head. A standout example is the team's choice of landmarks: *«…a VHF repeater unit that had been installed thirty years ago, and featured in successive aerial photographs; the junction of two ridges…»* Here the that-clause plus coordinated verb phrase (*«had been installed… and featured…»*) adds historical and technical detail. It does this without disturbing the underlying noun phrase head.

Listings and coordination also contribute to noun-phrase complexity in service of inventory or emphasis. We get full lists of equipment in dialogue: *«"...I packed my kitbag and in it I put an axe, a belay, and a crampon."»* And simple coordination inside noun phrases shows up in *«food and shelter»* or *«books and journals»*. This binds equal elements without embedding clauses.

Apposition is rare. Even so, it is present when personal titles or nicknames are introduced: *«Robert "Doc" Wright had seen the storm coming...»* This kind of appositive adds a secondary identifier alongside the proper name.

Noun phrases in the text are on average relatively simple. They rely on post-head elaboration: through brief relative clauses or prepositional modifiers. They deliver specificity with listings and coordination supplying bulk where needed and occasional apposition for naming clarity.

The narrative of the text is grounded in past simple tense: *«They loaded more equipment than they needed, and carried food and shelter…»* Nevertheless, the author weaves in other tense and aspectual forms. He does this to add immediacy and depth. In dialogue and radio exchanges, the present tense makes scenes feel more real *«"Bluff Point, this is Station K, Station K, receiving."»* The progressive aspect paints ongoing background actions: *«She was spending so much time helping him dress…»* The past perfect anchors earlier backstory: *«Doc had become rather fond of the place by the time they'd finished…»*. A sprinkling of present perfect conveys recent relevance—*«...I've made you a cup of tea…»*

Modal auxiliaries express ability, obligation and hypothesis. Can and could are used for expressing permission and ability (*«"...I can see that some of you have stories…"»*). Must is used to express for necessity. It is implied in therapeutic directives. Would is needed for future-in-the-past (*«She would leave it to grow tall and set seed.»*). Finally, might/may are used for expressing possibility: *«Your loved one may not be the same as the person they were before.»*

As well as that, phrasal verbs lend colloquial energy and concreteness. Namely, in one scene in the novel the team set off down the skiway and packed down snow for safety, Luke's terse *«Don't fucking panic.»* snaps urgency into dialogue. Together, these choices, in this case, blending simple past with progressive and perfect aspects, layering in modals and vivid phrasal verbs, give the prose both narrative momentum and emotional texture.

Prepositional phrases in the text are everywhere. They anchor actions and descriptions in space, time and condition and are almost invariably placed after the verb or noun they modify. These phrases specify exactly where and why things happen: the team *«trekked out from the field hut to take GPS readings»*, they *«carried food and shelter in case they were caught out»*, a storm *«moved through the valley»*, and *«At the foot of Priestley Head, beside a damaged skidoo, a small orange tent was gradually submerged by the snow.»*

The understanding of how, when and to what degree events unfold is richly qualified by adverb phrases either. Frequency adverbs punctuate repetition: *«...the same movements again and again.»* Manner phrases add precision: *«He blinked at her quickly, opening and closing his mouth.»* degree adverbs intensify emotion: *«I'm very tired.»* These adverbials may appear in the middle to modify a verb or finally to underscore its force.

Adjective phrases in the text are mostly attributive. They are positioned immediately before their head noun to supply visual, sensory or evaluative detail. Colour combinations like *«dark grey waters»* and *«faint orange light»*, compound forms such as *«oil-fired stove»*, and simple evaluative descriptors all paint vivid images. When they appear predicatively, they follow linking verbs to state conditions: *«Conditions were excellent…»*

The narrative is predominantly third-person, so first-person pronouns (*I, we, me, us*) appear mainly in dialogue or internal thought. They give immediacy to spoken passages. To demonstrate, characters say things like *«I can't see*

anything.» (Luke) or *«I'm not in charge.»* (Anna), first-person *I* and *we* occur almost exclusively in speech. Alternatively, most narration uses third-person pronouns (*he, she, they*) to track Doc and Anna. Demonstratives like *this* and *that* are used rarely, often only for emphasis. To clarify, phrases like *«All that ice and snow and sea and sky»* use *that* to intensify the scene. Determiners show a clear pattern: the definite article *the* is very common when referring to known or immediate elements (*«When the storm came in…»* or *«the air darkened»*, *«the sky»*, *«the ice»*). Indefinite articles (*a, an*) introduce new or unspecific items. For example, Doc is described as being *«lost in an ice storm in Antarctica»* (indefinite) but the narrative immediately calls it *"the storm"* once it has been introduced. This contrast (an ice storm vs. the storm) heightens the sense of particular danger. For the most part, *the* appears roughly 2–3 times as often as *a/an*. This reflects the concrete and specific nature of much of the imagery. Demonstratives and possessive determiners are limited mostly to dialogue or reflection (*«this situation»*, *«that was all»*, *«her imagination»*, *«his head»*, etc.). Therefore, they do not dominate the style.

Prepositions are used conventionally. They locate actions and descriptions in space and time. The opening lines use spatial prepositions heavily: *«dropped to his knees»*, *«arms around his head»*, *«flat on the ice»*, *«in the distance»*. They are meant to situate the reader precisely. In this case, "around" and "on" appear in quick succession: *«He wrapped his arms around his head and lay flat on the ice»*. Unlike, "in" is used for vague distance (*«in the distance»*). Equally, phrases like *«lost in an ice storm»* and *«sheltered in the lee of Garrard Ridge»* show typical use of "in", "on", "under" and "over". They are used to paint location. Prepositions also introduce subordinate clauses: *«after he was away»*, *«before the storm hit»*. The overall effect is a grounded and concrete narration. Actions and objects are almost always attached to places or times by prepositions.

The conjunction "and" dominates the text's connective style. It occurs extremely frequently. It is used to string together descriptions and actions. In particular, the author often employs *polysyndeton*. He repeats "and" before each list item rather than omitting conjunctions. For example, the vivid polar landscape is listed in series: *«All that ice and snow and sea and sky. Glaciers and ridges and icebergs and scree. Weathering and wind-form and shear.»* Each image is linked by "and" with no commas dividing them. For this reason, a rolling and cumulative effect is created. This pattern (often 3–4 items) appears throughout the text: *«ice and snow and sea and sky»* (4 items), *«Glaciers and ridges and icebergs and scree»* (4 items). Lists of three or more elements are common. When the list has more than two elements, the text almost always repeats "and" rather than using commas alone, the so-called "*and … and … and"* style. In spite of this, pure comma-only lists (asyndeton) are rare. In narrative passages, sequences of clauses also use "and" liberally. Many clauses are connected by "and": *«the flaps were dropped and the engines changed pitch and now the line of Garrard Ridge was clear.»*

When a series is introduced in the middle of clause, the standard conjunction plus commas pattern may appear: *«the field hut, the stores, the fuel dump, the long stretch of water, and the flags»*. Nevertheless, even then a final and is used. Coordinations of exactly two elements do not stand out as special. Sometimes two nouns are simply joined by "and" in the usual way.

Negative constructions are used to express uncertainty, denial or absence. The text frequently uses "not", "no", "nothing" and contractions like "wasn't", "didn't", "can't". For example, even in narration we have lines like *«he wasn't prepared for»* (the storm's violence) and *«his phone wasn't there»* – negating expectations. Dialogues especially contain not to show confusion or refusal (*«I'm not getting this.»*, *«We're not in charge.»*). The word "no" appears before nouns or phrases (*«there was no signal»*, *«no clear words»*) and "nothing" appears in emphatic contexts (*«nothing seemed real»*). Negation tends to heighten the characters' helplessness or denial. These negatives are often contracted or spoken (*«wasn't», «didn't», «can't»*), especially in dialogue. They reinforce the informal tone of speech. There is no elaborate syntactic feature with negation. It simply negates facts or abilities in the usual way.

As noted, first-person pronouns are rare outside dialogue. When they do appear, they often serve to pull the reader into a character's perspective. For instance, Luke says things like *«I can't see you», «I'm moving»*, and Anna in her thoughts or speech uses *I* and *we* to relate her concerns. The plural *we* occasionally appears in radio calls (*«we did it once and can do it again»*). Overall, "I" is used several hundred times, almost entirely in direct speech. The plural "we" is much rarer and again mostly in dialogue or reflective passage. By contrast, third-person pronouns are extremely common. He/him/his (referring mostly to Doc or Thomas) appears hundreds of times, and she/her appears hundreds of times in the second section (referring to Anna). They/them are also used when referring to Luke and Thomas as a pair. Possessive determiners (*his, her, their*) likewise appear in accord with whose viewpoint is focused. Notably, the mix of pronouns shifts between sections: first section is "he"–centered (Doc and assistants), second has both "he" (Doc) and "she" (Anna).

Demonstrative pronouns (this, that, these, those) are infrequent. When they do appear, *this* often points to an immediate idea or thing (*«this was a mistake»*). Pronoun *that* sometimes intensifies (as in *«all that ice»*). There are few instances of *these/those*.

Auxiliary verbs (forms of *be, have, do,* modals) are used normally. For example, *«he was dropped», «she had lost contact», «the flap was dropped.»* Modals like *can, could, would, should* appear in character speech (*«we could find Thomas»*, *«it should be ok»*). There is no marked overuse or stylistic effect specifically tied to auxiliaries. They serve their usual grammatical roles in building verb phrases.

There are some comparative and superlative adjectives/adverbs. However, no peculiar pattern is highlighted. Standard comparative forms (ending in *-er* or

using *more/less*) describe degrees (*«lower, higher, smaller, more urgent»*). Superlatives (ending in *-est* or using *most*) are fairly rare. One finds occasional phrases like *«the biggest surprise»* or *«the best chance»*. But these are not a primary stylistic focus. The narrative occasionally uses *more* or *most* (*«more than ten minutes»*, *«worst of all»*), but not in any unusual syntactic way. Comparisons tend to be straightforward, serving meaning rather than stylistic flair.

In addition to the heavy use of "and", the novel uses commas and dashes to shape flow. Often, short descriptive fragments are punctuated as separate sentences for effect (*«The polished blue sky behind the glacier turning a murky orange – brown. Darker. Blackening.»*). Em-dashes occur mostly in dialogue or interruptions. For example, a speech might break off with a dash: *«Doc was saying – and slumping back down.»* This signals an abrupt stop or cut-away. Parentheses are very rare, essentially only found in a couple of places (a caption *«(PRESUMED DEAD)»*). So aside from that there are virtually no true parenthetical asides. Instead, the writer often uses sentence fragments, ellipses, or dashes to indicate interruptions and asides.

The dialogue and interior monologues use many features of spoken language. Characters repeat words for emphasis (*«Luke, Luke, come in?»*), interject filler or swear words (*«Christ»* in frustration), and trail off or pause. For example, after Doc's stroke he narrates to himself: *«And, and, and. Up again, up again. Stand. Christ but what was… The pain in his head and the weakness. His weak right side. Numb the face rub. What was wrong. What was up. What's up, Doc?»*. This passage shows broken syntax, repeated conjunctions, self-corrections, and an interjection (*«Christ»*). These are hallmarks of a character struggling to speak. In radio conversations, ellipses and stutters appear. Transmissions have pauses and static (often written as ". . ." or long dashes). People say names twice for clarity : *«Thomas, Thomas, come in?»* Casual terms (*«fuck»*, *«bugger»*, filler *«yeah»*, *«okay»*). Tag questions are common in dialogue. These conversational features create a realistic spoken feel.

Lists of items usually contain three or more elements, as noted, and are typically joined by and (often repeated). Two-item lists are less striking (just "A and B" with a single *and*). There is almost never an instance like "sun, moon, stars" without any *and*, omitting the conjunction (asyndeton) is virtually absent. Occasionally a list uses the Oxford comma with a final *and* (especially in complex sentences or long descriptive chains). But even then the standard approach is to include and. Repeating and before each item is more common than using commas alone. Thus one sees consistently either *"A, B, and C"* or *"A and B and C"*, with a strong bias toward the latter in poetic/descriptive passages. There is no fixed rule about list length. McGregor uses whatever number fits the scene. Although, 3–4 items is typical for atmospheric description.

2.3. Figures of speech

The text uses repetition extensively. For example, single words or short phrases recur at beginnings or ends of clauses to heighten tension. A striking case is the repeated sequence *«Stand. Lean. Fall."* (imperative clauses) appearing in close succession. Similarly, short words and phrases are repeated for effect: *«White. White. Heavy. White.»* and *«Muffle. Muffle. Slow, slow.»* These serve as anaphora (repeated start of sentences) and epiphora (repeated ends). In another example, the character's utterances include *«I am here. I am hurt here. ... I am he who is hurt. I am here.»*, a clear anaphoric pattern (*«I am»*) that emphasises identity and disorientation. The triad *"crevices. creases. crevasses."* is a parallelism listing synonyms to stress the dangerous terrain. Even dialogue fragments are repeated: *«Of course, of course.»* underscores a weary acceptance.

Short clauses are often arranged in parallel or chiasmic fashion. For instance, the training mantra (*«find shelter… remain in place, keep moving, keep calm.»*) lays out a list of imperatives. The text also makes use of opposites (*«was up, was down»*). In this way, it creates a chiastic contrast of states.

These repetitions enhance key images and emotions. Namely, the urgent one-word sentences (*«Stand. Lean. Fall.»*) imitate breathless action in an accident. This creates a stronger dramatic effect. The echoing *«white»* and *«muffle»* sounds paints a sensory scene of blinding snow and muffled motion. Repeated verbs like *«fall, fall»* and *«breath, breath, breath»* slow the narrative rhythm to highlight the state of panic. The recurrence of *«I am…»* lines creates a sense of self-assertion midst chaos. Briefly, anaphora and epiphora here intensify mood (urgency, disorientation) and highlight motifs (whiteout, silence).

The text is full of sound patterns. For example, there is alliteration of sibilants and liquids: *«the slashing of the sled runners»* (repeating /sl/ and /s/), and *«pure cold blessing of silence»* (soft "s" and "c" sounds). The phrase *«...crevices. Ceases. Crevasses.»* repeats the hard /k/ ("cr-") and "s" sounds, creating a rolling, echoic effect that underscores the harsh icy landscape. Other examples include *«Follow the bearing, take careful care»* (repeated "car/ca-" sounds) and *«Sore muscles. Twist words.»* (sharp /s/, /tw/ sounds not shown above but present in style).

There is assonance and consonance in many lines. For instance, *«Snow pack tight. Wait. Up. Down. Floating. Low thing. Snow sling. Heart beat slow snow low light gone.»* features the repeated "o" vowel in *snow*, *low*, *gone*, giving a hollow, fading effect. The line *«Breath, breath, breath.»* doubles the same vowel to mimic panting. Consonants also cluster: the repeated "t" in *«Follow… take… careful… conditions»* and the /w/ sounds in *«wind was constant and roaring»* (personification).

The rhythm of the text varies with sound. Short, clipped sentences (often fragments or one-word lines) create a short disrupted rhythm. It is supposed to convey shock and urgency. By contrast, longer flowing descriptions (in calm scenes) slow the pace.

The novel contains plenty of figurative language and occasional linguistic deviations. There are few true neologisms. However, there are odd collocations and deviations. For example, *«numb the rub faith»* and *«rubbed the rum rawness»* (likely garbled speech after trauma) stand out as syntactically irregular. The text uses technical or regional terms like *«skidoo»* (a snowmobile) as common nouns, and *«whiteout»* for an Antarctic storm, though those are real terms in context.

Major figures of speech are present. Metaphor/personification: the storm and environment are often personified. For instance *«the storm had settled to a whiteout… like a blanket thrown over the hut»* turns weather into a living force covering the base. Similarly, *«the wind showed no sign of dropping. It was constant and roaring.»* gives wind animal-like roar. Silence itself is metaphorical: *«That pure cold blessing of silence.»* The narrator speaks of silence as a tangible *«blessing»* with temperature (*«cold»*), a synaesthetic image.

Similes and "as if" constructions explicitly link domains. Early on, a character thinks a storm is *«like being inside a jet engine. As though people knew what being inside a jet engine was like.»* This simile connects the sensory experience of windblast to a familiar (though hyperbolic) concept of a jet engine. Another simile is *«knew this place like the back of his hand»*, comparing familiarity with terrain to the hand's back. In the storm aftermath, *«white noise like applause»* likens radio static to clapping, and the settling storm is *«like a blanket»* over the landscape. These comparisons bridge the alien Antarctic domain to everyday experiences. This helps the reader grasp the characters' sensations.

Other figures include irony and paradox. For example, the instruction to *«keep calm»* while chaos ensues is inherently paradoxical. Luke internally notes it's *«pure boring…awe-inspiring and majestic»* to be in Antarctica. This contrasts the idea of adventure with the tedium of waiting. The line *«People said these things, but the words didn't always fit.»* ironically comments on the inadequacy of clichéd similes.

In summary, the prose mixes straight narrative with vivid imagery. Metaphors and similes (*«blessing of silence»*, *«like a blanket»*) enrich meaning by linking the extreme setting to common concepts. Personification (wind *«roaring»*) heightens atmosphere. Repetitions and unusual phrasing (fragmented commands) mimic stress and confusion. All these tropes work together to convey the harshness of the Antarctic and the characters' inner states.

2.4. Context and cohesion

The prose relies heavily on simple coordinating conjunctions. For example, the opening storm scene strings clauses with *«and»*: *«When the storm came in it was unexpected and Thomas Myers was dropped to his knees.»* However, many sentences stand alone without obvious connectors. As a result, they create a staccato flow of actions: *«The air darkened… There was a roar and everything went white…»* Subordinate linkers and discourse adverbials are rare ("however",

"therefore" hardly appear). So, much of the flow is paratactic or driven by simple "and", "but", etc. (for instance Doc's narration uses *"but"* to contrast clauses). Overall, logical connections often come from context or parallel ideas rather than explicit markers.

In many scenes the meaning is carried implicitly. Characters' thoughts are given in short bursts without conjunctions, so the reader infers links. For example, Luke thinks *«They weren't lost. They couldn't be lost… The best thing would be to stay in place…»* as if reasoning to himself. The sentences form a chain of thought without overt connectives. They are linked by continuity of situation. Instructions and internal commands often appear as fragments or repeated phrases (*«Keep dry. Remain calm, stay in place.»*), relying on context for coherence.

Characters are introduced by name. Then they are almost immediately referred to by pronouns ("he", "she", "they"). For instance, after naming Thomas Myers, later sentences in his section use "he" repeatedly. Likewise, Luke's thoughts use "they" and "he" to refer to the others: *«They weren't lost… stay in place.»* These pronouns tie back to recently mentioned people (Thomas, Luke, Doc) and thus reinforce continuity. Substitute forms like nicknames or titles are also used to vary reference: Robert Wright is often called "Doc" or *«the general assistant»* to avoid constant repetition. This is an example of variation in reference. For example, Doc is referred to by name, by role, and by pronoun in close succession. Ellipsis occurs mostly in dialogue or thought (radio voices break off mid-word *«Come in… K… K…»*) or in truncated commands.

To avoid monotonous repetition of names, the text uses synonyms and descriptions: *«Doc did a good polar explorer. He had the beard for it.»* Environmental terms and thematic words are often repeated for emphasis: a string of related nouns (*«All that ice and snow and sea and sky. Glaciers and ridges and icebergs…»*) ties together the scene vividly. Key phrases are echoed to reinforce meaning (e.g. the disaster-survival mantra *«Remain calm. Stay in place.»* appears more than once). This semantic clustering (recycling words from the same field, like weather and polar imagery) helps maintain cohesion across sentences and passages.

The book is told in third-person, shifting between characters' perspectives. The writer does not address the reader directly (no second-person "you" or authorial asides). Each section is colored by a character's viewpoint (Thomas's section, then Luke's, then Doc's, then Anna's, etc.). However, the "I" of narration is not used . Only characters themselves use "I" when thinking or speaking. For example, Thomas's section consistently refers to him as "he", not "I", indicating an external narrator. Likewise, when Doc or Luke think, it's presented in third person (Luke's thoughts appear as his inner monologue narrated *«They weren't lost… The best thing would be to stay in place.»* rather than *«I wasn't lost»*).

Dialogue and phone/radio calls clearly indicate who is talking to whom. Characters speak in direct quotes and use first- or second-person pronouns accordingly. For instance, Anna is awakened by colleagues saying *«It's Robert.*

It's your husband…», directly addressing her. Luke calls Thomas on the radio, *«Doc, Thomas, come in…»*, addressing his teammates directly. In contrast, the narrator (the implied speaker of the prose) never uses "you". The narration is not written to or by any character. First-person pronouns appear only in dialogue or very inward thought.

The authorial stance is neutral and empathetic. The tone remains respectful and caring towards all characters. There is no ironic or distant commentary. Even as Doc suffers aphasia, the narration gently conveys his confusion (his viewpoint "breaks apart" into disordered words) without mockery. The writing often mirrors the characters' emotional states (terse in crisis, tender in recovery). This suggests a sensitive engagement with the subject. Overall the narrator treats the story seriously and sympathetically (as illustrated by the careful depiction of stroke and communication struggles) rather than judgmentally.

Characters' spoken words are given in direct speech with quotation marks (radio calls and conversations appear verbatim, e.g. *«Come in… K… K…»*). Internal thoughts are generally reported through third-person narration, sometimes in free indirect style. For example, we see Luke's worry directly as his thoughts (*«They shouldn't have split up…»*) without always using "he thought," but still in third person. Anna's perspective is shown by focusing on her actions and perceptions. The prose follows her: *«The phone was buzzing… She answered it before she was quite awake.»*). In Doc's sections, his stream-of-consciousness or memory is sometimes shown in broken first-person fragments, reflecting his aphasia. For instance, disjointed phrases when he speaks or thinks).

The style varies with each viewpoint. The *LEAN* (Antarctic) sections are fast-paced and fragmented: short, urgent sentences to match the crisis. The *FALL* sections (Anna and hospital) are calmer and more introspective, with slightly longer, descriptive sentences. The *STAND* section shifts among many voices (therapist Liz, daughter Sara, etc.). Each has a distinct tone (clinical vs. conversational). Speech registers change too: radio dialogue is clipped and static, family conversations are personal and colloquial, professional talk (inquest, therapy) is more formal. These shifts in diction and rhythm signal who is speaking or thinking. They emphasise the change of context in each part.

3. Results

As McGregor employs many strategies to fully immerse the reader in the characters' emotional and physical reality, the narrative perspective plays a crucial role in forming the plot in *Lean Fall Stand*. The plot mostly centers on Robert Wright and his two coworkers. They attempt to survive the Antarctic blizzard. This id followed by his recovery from the stroke he suffered there.

The author primarily uses a third-person omniscient point of view in the text. Yet, there are several distinct variants and strategies that change as the plot progresses. Although a third-person omniscient narrator presents the events,

McGregor regularly switches the focus to other people. This gives the reader a glimpse inside each character's thoughts, emotions, and sensory experiences by allowing them to enter their consciousness. By allowing the reader to observe the same event from several perspectives, this shifting focalisation produces a rich, multi-perspective narrative. It effectively conveys the complexity of the problem portrayed. Every character has depth because the author reveals their innermost feelings, ideas, and responses to the reader.

However, McGregor's use of shifting narrative perspective is not simply a stylistic device. It is fundamental to how survival is portrayed as a fractured, uncertain, and deeply individual experience. While the storm is meant to be a shared external threat, the internal experience of facing it is sharply different for each character. The story lets readers enter each character's mind. This makes it clear how disorienting and isolating survival can feel.

When the storm strikes, Thomas's perspective is the first we follow. His disorientation is immediate: *«The roar of it was everything. He had only his weight against the ice to know which way up he was in the world. He couldn't see the others. He couldn't see anything.»* The absence of visual cues and sensory overload puts the reader directly into his vulnerable physical state. But when the focalisation shifts to Luke, the survival challenge is reframed. It is not as a question of physical endurance, but one of decision-making and risk assessment: *«He could stay put. The training had been ambiguous on this point. They'd been told to stay put in bad weather, to avoid the risk of getting lost. But they'd also been told to find any shelter they could, and to make contact. If he couldn't make contact or find shelter, the case for staying put seemed weak.»* The moral tension of survival is highlighted by Luke's situation: to act or to wait, to move or to stay. This change in perspective shows that survival is not only about the situation. It's also about the mind. It is shaped by how one interprets limited and conflicting information.

When the story enters Doc's mind, his inner thoughts show his experience. In this way, the strategy continues. Yet even he becomes destabilized: *«You won't fall until you let go, a supervisor had told him once, during crevasse training. The logic wasn't entirely sound but the spirit was a fine one.»* There is a quiet irony in his thoughts that reveals his awareness of how thin the line between control and collapse really is. Even the most experienced among them are reduced to base-level instincts: hold on, don't let go, keep thinking.

The narrative constructs a panoramic view of a survival event that no single character fully understands by switching between these perspectives: Thomas on the ice, Luke beside the skidoo, Doc clinging to the cliff. The reader sees how each man makes his choice in the dark, both literally and figuratively. Survival depends as much on flawed perception as on skill or strength. The effect is to dramatize the reality: that survival, in its rawest form, is an interior battle against confusion, panic, and isolation.

Moreover, McGregor makes strategic use of non-overlapping perspectives. It is done to emphasise emotional distance between characters. At no point during the storm do the characters see or speak to each other clearly. Instead, their understanding of each other's situations is partial and speculative. Luke wonders if Thomas is nearby, but can't be sure: *«He'd been right over there when the storm hit. No distance at all. They should regain contact. Wait for the weather to clear.»* Similarly, Doc assumes his team will *«shelter in place, as per the training»* though this is far from what actually happens. These narrative gaps reinforce the idea that even in a shared crisis, survival remains a solitary act.

In this way, the novel undermines the illusion of collective struggle by insisting on the solitary interiority of survival. While the characters are physically close, the storm severs them not just logistically but emotionally and cognitively. McGregor's use of many third-person perspectives, then, is not merely a narrative flourish. It is believed to be a structural representation of isolation in crisis. Survival is not experienced collectively. It is experienced through lonely, diverging streams of perception.

The author uses embedded flashbacks (brief, unexpected memory intrusions) to anchor his characters mentally when the pressures of survival threaten to overwhelm them. These sudden trips back to training or routine act as psychological lifelines amid crisis, even as they fracture linear time. As Doc Wright scrambles across loose scree, the narration interrupts the freefall with a crevasse-training mantra: *«You won't fall until you let go, a supervisor had told him once, during crevasse training. The logic wasn't entirely sound but the spirit was a fine one.»*

On the ice, Thomas Myers clings to basic survival drills even as the storm batters him: *«The important thing was to stay calm, and take stock of the situation. Remember the training: find shelter or make shelter, remain in place, establish contact with other members of the party, keep moving, keep calm.»* His flashback to formal instructions interrupts the terror, giving him a mental checklist to follow.

Luke Adebayo's hesitation in the wind is pierced by recollection of protocol: *«They'd been told to stay put in bad weather, to avoid the risk of getting lost. But they'd also been told to find any shelter they could, and to make contact.»* This memory intrusion doesn't just inform his choices. It dramatizes the moral weight of each split-second decision in crisis.

By weaving these flashbacks into moments of extreme duress, the author gives his characters access to hard-won knowledge even as their present reality frays. The technique both anchors them and us as readers in proven strategies for survival. It also reminds us how fragile our grasp on time and self becomes under life-threatening stress.

One of the most powerful narrative ironies in *Lean Fall Stand* arises from the tension between perspective and agency: between what the author allowed the reader to understand and what the characters themselves are able to do. Through shifting third-person limited narration, McGregor creates a panoramic

understanding of the storm and its effects. However, this expanded perspective offers no rescue and no intervention. The broader shape of the disaster and the tragic misunderstandings that separate the characters can be seen by the reader. And yet, like the characters themselves, remains powerless to stop it.

For instance, the reader knows that Doc is alive and only narrowly avoiding a deadly fall, even while Thomas and Luke, separated by weather and silence, begin to fear the worst. The narrative tells us: *«He had been in these situations before. This was no different. You didn't go thirty-odd seasons on the ice without getting into one or two scrapes. The trick was to slow down and start thinking. Always have the next step in mind.»* But even with his experience, Doc is left without functioning communication. Moreover, he is soon injured by falling debris: *«Doc got on the radio, and started to ask Thomas to confirm his location. Something sharp struck him on the back of the neck and he went down fast.»* Despite the seeming calm in his internal monologue, disaster still comes. The reader sees the fragility of experience and how control can be undermined in a moment.

Similarly, Luke assumes Thomas is close and safe. However, the reader knows that Thomas is already adrift on an ice floe. *«He saw Luke, in the distance. The problem was immediately clear. The wind came rushing back in again and everything went dark.»* Luke, unaware, continues trying to communicate: *«Thomas, what? What? Confirm? You can't be drifting.»* The disconnect here is excruciating. The reader, caught between these perspectives, holds more factual knowledge than either character. Despite this, they are still bound by the logic of the novel's world: one in which information cannot overcome circumstance.

This irony persists even in quieter scenes. When Luke assumes Doc will probably be waiting for them at the hut and imagines him *«standing in the doorway of the storm porch, waiting for them. Making a face, like: What time do you call this, lads?»* the reader is already aware that Doc is in serious trouble and not, in fact, safe. The contrast between what characters believe and what readers know builds tension and pathos, especially because it does nothing to alter outcomes.

This narrative strategy also denies the comfort of a central, authoritative perspective. No character has a full grasp of what is happening. The reader becomes the only entity with multi-perspective clarity — and yet, this clarity does not empower, it isolates. It creates a sense of helpless witnessing, like the disempowerment the characters themselves feel. McGregor thus creates an unusual narrative paradox: the more the reader knows, the more acutely they feel the futility of that knowledge in averting disaster. The storm is not just meteorological, but epistemological: a breakdown of communication, trust, and certainty.

In this way, *Lean Fall Stand* presents survival not as a heroic triumph of knowledge, but as an existential ordeal. Even full insight cannot resolve chaos.

The characters struggle to see each other clearly. The reader, though allowed to see it all, can only watch as lives diverge and unravel.

Additionally, McGregor employs a stream of consciousness to illustrate the characters' disorganized and fragmented thoughts, particularly during times of extreme stress, as they deal with the storm in Antarctica in the early section of the book. Particularly during the storm sections, the characters' bewilderment and fear are conveyed through disorganized, broken sentences: *«The roar of it was everything. He had only his weight against the ice to know which way up he was in the world. He couldn't see the others. He couldn't see anything.»* As the character becomes disoriented amid the storm, this disjointed phrase pattern reflects his perplexity. Here's another illustration: *«Remain calm. Stay in place. Make contact. He shouldn't have put down the radio. He shouldn't have moved away from Luke. He shouldn't have agreed with Doc's idea about climbing Priestley Head just for the sake of a photograph.»* The author uses short, clipped words to depict a character attempting to maintain composure but gradually losing control as panic begins to set in. Repetitive lines in the passage express his regret and second-guessing. They highlight his growing powerlessness and dread as the storm occurs.

McGregor aligns narrative pacing with the characters' physical and mental deterioration. He uses sentence structure and rhythm to simulate the body's breakdown under duress. As the environment grows harsher, language deteriorates. It reflects the effects of hypothermia, panic, and exhaustion. This stylistic fragmentation is thought to be not merely aesthetic. It renders the struggle for life as something readers can feel through the rhythm and tempo of the prose itself.

For example, when Thomas is crawling through the storm, disoriented and increasingly vulnerable, the pacing of the text shortens abruptly: *«He shouted Luke's name again. His voice was nothing against the storm. He kept moving to keep himself warm. The noise of the wind made it hard to think clearly. The radio was behind him now. He could feel the chill beginning to bite.»* The repetition of subject-verb-object clauses and the lack of subordination mirrors the degradation of higher cognitive function under physical stress. The short, clipped sentences reflect not just panic. They also show a narrowing of consciousness. His thoughts becoming more primitive, more reactive.

A similar physiological unraveling is evident in the way his internal thoughts collapse into bursts of instinct: *«He was doing this all wrong. He should have stayed in place when the storm hit. He should never have moved.»* Obsessive thought loops often appear in trauma responses. The repeated phrase *«he should»* imitates them. The rhythm echoes his labored, panicked breathing. The cadence slows down and speeds up erratically. This is supposed to mimick adrenaline surges followed by fatigue.

Even moments of attempted clarity are undermined by fragmentation and as Thomas tries to assess the situation: *«He was crouching with his back to the*

wind. Luke should be with the skidoo and the bags away to his left. To his left and a little ahead.» That final repetition of spatial orientation (*«To his left and a little ahead»*) is subtly disorienting. It's a loop of reassurance that is also an admission of uncertainty. The character is repeating information in an attempt to regain control. However, it's clear he doesn't trust his own bearings. This shows the mental confusion from cold and fear. It appears in the flow of the writing.

Later, the narrative begins to break apart as Thomas starts drifting on an ice floe: *«"Repeat. I am on an ice floe, drifting across Lopez Sound. You fucking read me? Over." / "Thomas, what? What? Confirm? You can't be drifting. It must be a tide crack. Work around it? Find your way, I mean. Thomas?" / "Luke, I've got the GPS running. I'm drifting. For real."»* The intercut radio dialogue is increasingly broken by static, interruptions, and ellipses. This is supposed to reflect not only their failing communication devices, but also their fading physical energy and slipping grip on reality. These fragmentation techniques underscore the emotional and bodily cost of survival. We feel the characters slowing down, breaking down, and losing coherence as their physical states worsen.

Doc's internal monologue, too, shows this deterioration in form. When he is clinging to the edge of the cliff, the pace of thought becomes staccato and instinctive: *«He closed his eyes and concentrated. He arched one foot out and around to the left, bringing his knee up towards his chest. The noise of the wind was so violent it was difficult to think.»* Again, there's a flattening of sentence rhythm, a reflection of tunnel vision, and the shift from action to sheer sensation.

These techniques create a form of storytelling that connects thought and physicality. They become one. As the characters struggle to maintain bodily integrity, the language itself deteriorates. This echoes the fragility of life under extreme conditions. The reader does not simply observe decline; they feel it unfold, line by line, breath by breath.

Furthermore, the author distinguishes the novel's opening section by its sparse speech and notable quiet. Both of them are appropriate for the Antarctic environment. Character-to-character communication is frequently fragmented or disrupted, particularly during the storm. The author utilizes the inability to communicate, especially through radio, as a metaphor for powerlessness and loneliness. The characters attempt to speak at various points but are only able to hear static or snippets of conversation. There is less conversation and the silence becomes just as significant as the words. The individuals struggle with their own internal problems. This illustrates their growing estrangement from both themselves and one another: *«He heard the radio again, and again he scrabbled around at his feet. Luke's voice was shrill, and distant. There were breaks in the transmission. "Doc, Thomas, come in. Come in, Doc? [. . .] anyone? [. . .]"»* The character's increasing sense of powerlessness and loneliness as they try to connect amidst the mayhem is highlighted by the transmission's fragments. Here's another example: *«"Thomas, Thomas, come in? Doc, come in? Over." There was another hiss, and the faint crackle of an incoming transmission. And*

then nothing.» The character's repeated calls show their deep emotional and physical loneliness. The silence is broken by the hiss of static, which indicates a breakdown in communication: *«"Nice one, Thomas, thank fuck. You were starting to worry me, where the fuck are you? I can't see you. I can't see anything.""Yes, Luke . . . issue, over.""Missing word before issue, can you repeat, over?"»* Static and missing words interrupt the conversation, illustrating the protagonists' inability to communicate fully and their increasing confusion: *«He heard Luke's voice again. The sound was fainter now. There was a kind of ringing or rushing in his ears and he couldn't be sure he was hearing the radio at all.»* Silence and internal confusion are combined in this section. The character becomes mentally and physically disoriented.

To allow the reader close access to the characters' innermost thoughts, especially during times of severe internal turmoil or crisis, the text makes considerable use of free indirect speech. By using this style, McGregor is able to seamlessly transition between the third-person narrative and the character's interiority. This gives a complex depiction of their psychological states: *«Remain calm. Stay in place. Make contact.»* By putting the reader inside the character's head through free indirect speech, McGregor gives us a glimpse of his attempt at self-assurance without using overt cues. His natural need for training under duress is depicted by the thoughts, which fit in perfectly with the story: *«He shouldn't have put down the radio. He shouldn't have moved away from Luke. He shouldn't have agreed with Doc's idea about climbing Priestley Head just for the sake of a photograph.»* The character's internal conflict and third-person narration alternate seamlessly in this section. This gives readers a glimpse into his mental self-recrimination as he considers his deeds. The closeness of his anxiety and guilt is heightened by the absence of clear attribution: *«It was too soon to be worried, but he should have heard something by now. He was getting cold already. He checked the battery levels and the volume, tucked the handset back inside his jacket, and ran through his options.»* By combining his logical reasoning with the third-person point of view, the story shows the character's process of analyzing the circumstances and assessing his options. It also highlights his pragmatic side. As a result, the reader becomes more intimate with his internal conflict thanks to this strategy.

Free indirect discourse also allows McGregor to render internal conflict without overt dramatization. When Luke thinks whether to stay by the skidoo or seek help, the narration closely follows his reasoning. Yet, it remains free of external commentary: *«It was too soon to be worried, but he should have heard something by now. He was getting cold already. He checked the battery levels and the volume, tucked the handset back inside his jacket, and ran through his options.»* There's no need to state that Luke is afraid. The flat, procedural listing of actions does it intead. The narrative form echoes the inner logic of someone trying to maintain composure through a series of small, deliberate decisions. Because it is understated, the emotional tension is created precisely.

McGregor often uses free indirect discourse to create emotional layering. A surface of practical thought that is undermined by subconscious fear. This duality is evident in moments where characters attempt to convince themselves they are fine, even as their language betrays uncertainty. For example, when Doc regains footing on the cliff: *«You won't fall until you let go, a supervisor had told him once, during crevasse training. The logic wasn't entirely sound but the spirit was a fine one.»* What begins as memory becomes internal reassurance. Then it becomes ironic reflection. The tonal shift from mantra to qualification to dry internal commentary reflects his emotional state more richly than direct description could. The reader understands that he is scared, even as he tries to rationalize control.

The immediacy created by free indirect discourse is also critical in portraying mental and moral ambiguity. In the aftermath of the storm, when characters are unsure whether they did the right thing, McGregor lets their justifications and regrets enter into the narration. The absence of overt narrative judgment means readers must parse emotional cues for themselves. It builds empathy without sentimentality.

This stylistic proximity to thought is especially significant in a novel about trauma, disorientation, and survival. Rather than observe the characters from the outside, the reader inhabits them. Their confusion becomes our confusion. Their dread acts in the rhythm of the sentences. Through free indirect discourse, McGregor removes the barrier between reader and character. He collapses psychological distance and turns emotional response into a shared experience.

Through its innovative use of perspective, voice, and narrative structure, *Lean Fall Stand* ultimately presents survival as both an external ordeal and an internal reckoning. The Antarctic storm may be the immediate threat, but McGregor's focus lies equally, if not more intensely, on the psychological, emotional, and moral crises that erupt within each character when stripped of control, clarity, or connection. Survival becomes a layered conflict: a fight not only against the physical environment, but against one's own confusion, fear, guilt, and isolation.

This duality is captured with striking clarity in Thomas's storm narrative. There the storm becomes almost metaphysical in its force. He cannot orient himself, either spatially or morally: *«He was doing this all wrong. He should have stayed in place when the storm hit. He should never have moved.»* His physical decisions (where to crawl, whether to call out) are driven by self-recrimination and the overwhelming need to re-establish meaning and contact. The storm here functions as both literal danger and an emblem of internal collapse. The survival question becomes not just, "Will he live?" but "Can he continue to think, decide, and feel under this pressure?"

Jon McGregor endows the Antarctic elements with an almost sentient presence. Wind, ice, and storms take on a quasi-omniscient vantage. This turns nature into both witness and active participant in the struggle for life. The storm

announces itself before any character can react: *«The air darkened in the distance. There was a roar and everything went white against him.»* Here, the author depicts the storm's approach as a conscious act: the ice and wind obliterate vision in a deliberate, engulfing roar.

Once the storm is upon them, it isn't believed to refuse to yield: *«The wind showed no sign of dropping. It was constant and roaring.»* The wind's persistence reads like an omniscient judge. It is indifferent to human frailty. Its roar is a constant reminder that nature's agenda supersedes all human plans.

In the aftermath, the storm's power is felt even by the refuge of the hut: *«Doc Wright crashed into the storm porch and forced the door shut… The storm was nailing itself to the door.»* By personifying the storm as something that *«nails»* itself to wood, McGregor grants it agency. It is not merely backdrop, but a character whose influence shapes every act of survival.

Through these shifts in focalisation (from Thomas's terror, to Luke's sheltering, to Doc's return) the text reminds readers that survival in *Lean, Fall, Stand* is a dialogue with elemental forces. Nature doesn't simply witness human endurance. It challenges, tests, and ultimately defines the terms on which survival is earned.

Similarly, not only physical extremity but a relentless sense of responsibility, paralysis, and moral uncertainty shape Luke's struggle: *«He could stay put. The training had been ambiguous on this point. They'd been told to stay put in bad weather, to avoid the risk of getting lost. But they'd also been told to find any shelter they could, and to make contact.»* His survival depends on more than staying warm or dry. It depends on navigating the mental ambiguity of leadership and judgment. The question of whether he should search for Thomas and Doc or if he should risk splitting up further highlights that surviving a catastrophe requires more than reacting: it involves deciding who one wants to be in crisis.

Even Doc, the most experienced of the three, is not spared this internal battle. His thoughts during his near fall reveal not just survival instincts but the deeper toll of enduring decades of exposure to the ice: *«You won't fall until you let go, a supervisor had told him once, during crevasse training. The logic wasn't entirely sound but the spirit was a fine one.»* This wry, self-aware comment reveals how psychological survival, the act of maintaining identity, meaning, and belief, is as precarious as physical safety.

This internal-external duality is intensified by structuring the storm narrative around disconnection. Each man is isolated not just physically by the storm, but emotionally and cognitively. Their inability to communicate (their broken radio signals, misread GPS coordinates, fragmentary sentences) symbolises a broader failure to connect with themselves and each other in crisis. In this way, survival is depicted as something deeply solitary. Even if it takes place in a shared environment.

The novel's narrative design mirrors this theme: shifting perspectives, fragmented syntax, stream of consciousness, and free indirect discourse do more than style the prose — they become formal expressions of survival itself. The characters break apart; so does the language. Thought becomes scattered, time elastic, causality uncertain. The reader is not an observer but a participant in this fragmentation. We feel the cold not through description, but through rhythm. We sense panic not because text mentions it, but because it pulses in the shape of the prose.

In *Lean Fall Stand*, survival is not a moment of triumph. It is a prolonged confrontation with vulnerability: physical, emotional, and existential. McGregor refuses the heroic arc. He opts instead for a quiet, immersive realism. It exposes how the fight to live is fought as much inside the mind as against the world outside. The storm may pass, but its residue lingers in broken speech, haunted memory, and the long, uncertain road to recovery that follows.

Jon McGregor repeatedly re-orients focalisation through the characters' senses, sight, sound, touch. Each moment of survival becomes a visceral, embodied recalibration. For instance, in the moment when Thomas first confronts the storm, his visual world collapses into noise: *«The air darkened in the distance. There was a roar and everything went white against him.»* Here, Thomas's vision (*«everything went white»*) instantly yields to auditory terror (*«there was a roar»*), forcing him to navigate by sound alone. Immediately afterwards, the narrative shifts into tactile awareness: *«His clothes felt as though they were being torn from his body, the air sucked from his lungs.»* What began as a sensory overwhelm in the ears now lands on the skin and the breath. This underlines how survival demands continuous reattunement to changing stimuli.

What was once an auditory battlefield resolves back into sight when the wind finally pauses: *«As the wind faded, the visibility lifted. The sunlight moved hard against the water in all directions.»* This return of clear vision—*«visibility lifted»*—feels earned, the sensory pendulum swinging back to the eyes after a protracted crisis.

Later, Doc clings to the cliff. Every sense of his recalibrates to subtle cues: *«He heard the faint crackle of his radio, and felt the vibration of it against his ribs.»* Sound becomes the lifeline (*«faint crackle»*). It is registered through touch (*«vibration…against his ribs»*). Hhis body turns into an antenna for rescue.

By dynamically shifting focalisation between senses, McGregor makes survival an act of embodied adaptation. Characters don't just strategize mentally, they must constantly relearn how to see, hear, and feel their world anew.

In moments of acute crisis, McGregor collapses the characters' sensory experience: sight, hearing, balance. Survival becomes a struggle against their own faltering perceptions. During the storm Thomas's sense of hearing is overwhelmed: *«There was a kind of ringing or rushing in his ears and he couldn't be sure he was hearing the radio at all.»* This *«ringing or rushing»* turns a lifeline

(the radio) into a source of confusion. It forces him to question whether his own ears can be trusted.

Simultaneously, visibility collapses into near-darkness: *«Luke could barely see his hand in front of his face. It was too much of a risk.»* Here, the storm strips away spatial orientation. Every step becomes a gamble.

The constant motion of wind and ice induces vertigo: *«He felt dizzy. Unsteady. Almost seasick.»* By likening his balance to seasickness, McGregor shows that even on solid ground, the body can betray the mind. Basic locomotion becomes hazardous.

By layering these distortions (muffled hearing, blurred vision, spinning balance), McGregor dramatizes that the truest battlefield sometimes lies within. Characters must not only outwit the elements but also recalibrate shattered senses. Every step, every transmission, is turned into an act of fierce, embodied endurance.

The novel's shifting between micro- and macro-spatial focalisation transforms the Antarctic landscape into both an immediate, treacherous obstacle course and a vast arena of existential challenge. When Doc Wright clings to the cliff, the narration zeroes in on his body's point of contact with the rock: *«His hands felt loose inside his gloves. The scree felt slippery beneath him.»* This close-up of tactile detail (glove against loose scree) makes each millimeter of progress a matter of life or death.

Before that intimate moment, the author reveals the full sweep of the valley: *«From here the view of the whole valley was excellent. In the near distance, the red field hut of Station K sheltered in the lee of Garrard Ridge and the peaks of K7 and K8 beyond.»* This sudden wide-angle shot reminds us that Doc's tiny foothold sits within an immense, indifferent landscape.

Similarly, the crackle of the lifeline radio becomes a focused sonic detail while the wider roar of the storm frames the bigger picture of elemental opposition:*«He heard the faint crackle of his radio, and felt the vibration of it against his ribs.»*

Thomas's inch-by-inch crawl on the ice is punctuated by brief pulls back to the expanse of Lopez Sound and the cliffs beyond. This is meant to underline that one must measure every small movement against vast spatial bearings: *«The wind was too strong to stand up in, so he edged forwards on his elbows and knees. Forwards and to the left.»*

By alternating these micro-views and macro-views, McGregor choreographs survival as both a series of pinpoint, bodily engagements and an ongoing orientation to an immense, perilous world. There every fingertip grip connects to the horizon's distant ridges.

After the Antarctic station incident in *Lean Fall Stand*, Jon McGregor shifts his narrative techniques to reflect a new kind of survival. It is not the physical struggle against nature, as in the storm, but the long, quiet, internal fight to recover identity, communication, and meaning. The techniques that are used by him

change accordingly: from the frantic, fragmented urgency of the storm scenes to a more restrained, psychologically intimate mode.

Following the dramatic storm and physical survival crisis of the *LEAN* section, McGregor orchestrates a profound shift in both narrative pace and tone in the aftermath of Robert Wright's stroke. As the focus moves from environmental danger to the long, slow path of rehabilitation, the urgency of the prose gives way to a gentler, often halting rhythm. This mirrors both Doc's condition and the emotional recalibration of those around him. Where the Antarctic scenes were marked by fragmentation, noise, and bodily disorientation, the post-incident chapters slow down to reflect silence, stillness, and interior struggle.

This tonal change is most immediately noticeable in the *STAND* section. There the narration decelerates dramatically. Doc's wife, Anna, becomes a central perspective. Through her, the novel enters a more domestic and reflective register. The previously visceral, survivalist tone gives way to one that is tentative and observant, reflecting the world of hospitals, waiting rooms, and therapeutic repetition. For example, the passage opens quietly: *«The nurses came and checked his blood pressure, his heart rate, his breathing. They lifted his arms and scratched his feet and asked him to swallow water. She watched, and she waited. She tried to work. She got distracted. Aphasia is the name given to a wide range of language deficits caused by damage to the brain.»* This passage illustrates the deceleration of narrative pace, the intrusion of medical language (*«aphasia», «recovery»*), and the quiet tension of caregiving. It has a stark contrast to the earlier survivalist tone.

This deceleration is also evident in the scenes of speech therapy. There Doc's thoughts, language, and sense of self move painfully slowly. In a poignant moment, the narrative lingers on the simple effort to speak a single word: *«"Puh—puh—puh." / "You can say this already?" / "Pay-lane. Red. Red pay-lane." / "Plane? Yes. Aeroplane, very good." / "Red pay-lane."»* The fragmentation here is no longer caused by external chaos, but by internal neurological breakdown. The rhythm of the prose mirrors the rhythm of recovery — tentative, repetitive, halting. McGregor is no longer writing in the register of survival action. He is now writing in the slow time of rehabilitation.

This slower pace also becomes emotionally charged. The slower the narrative, the more weight each word carries. The author invites readers to sit inside the moments of failure and near-success, to inhabit the long pauses and the painstaking effort involved in relearning language. The silence that dominated the storm now returns in another form. It is not loud with wind, but thick with unsaid words and frustrated thoughts.

Anna's emotional response also unfolds with this slower pacing. Her early reactions to Doc's stroke are described with clarity, but not very sentimentally. For instance: *«She was suddenly very tired. He wasn't ready, surely. She said this to Brian, or Kirsty, and they both said he was doing really well. He was out of*

danger. He was fit enough to travel and would do better in a British hospital, in a familiar environment. I thought we would be here for weeks, Anna said, and Brian apologised.» The passage presents her reaction with quiet clarity and exhaustion rather than overt emotionalism. There is no breakdown, no dramatics. There is just a tired recognition of how quickly the situation is moving beyond her control. It's emotionally charged, but the language stays restrained and observational.

Maintaining a cautious tone even as small improvements occur, McGregor also resists narrative resolution in this section. There is expected no triumphant arc, no sudden breakthroughs. Progress is incremental and tentative when it happens.

In this way, the shift in narrative pace and tone reflects a second kind of survival: the long, invisible endurance that follows crisis. The storm demanded physical stamina; recovery demands patience, humility, and emotional resilience. McGregor slows the narrative tempo to honor the difficulty of this quieter struggle. In this way, he allows silence, simplicity, and subtlety to carry emotional weight.

Additionally, narrative time is bended by the author to dramatize both immediate danger and protracted endurance. In the storm episode, a few seconds of ice-blast become an epic ordeal. McGregor breaks down Thomas's reaction into painstaking detail: *«He edged forwards on his elbows and knees. Forwards and to the left. He called Luke's name, and heard nothing.»* Those three short sentences unfold over mere heartbeats. Yet, on the page they slow to a crawl, letting the reader feel each inch of agonizing progress.

During rehabilitation, single exercises gain the same "zoom in" treatment: *«Open your mouth wide. Stretch. Hold for three seconds. Relax. Press your top lip over your bottom lip. Hold. Relax.»* An entire paragraph describes one slow series of mouth movements. This micro-focus dramatizes how every tiny progress is a battlefield of its own. Likewise, a week's worth of therapy can be compressed or dilated at will: *«She had to talk him into it, over several days. She had to plan their route carefully, and allow plenty of time… It took forty-five minutes to walk to the village…»* McGregor bends time to show both the slog of persuasion (*«over several days»*) and the precise length of a single outing (*«forty-five minutes»*). He reminds us that survival in this phase is both marathon and mile.

By stretching single actions into detailed paragraphs and zooming swiftly over entire days or weeks, the author makes "survival" a matter of mastering both the instant and the infinite. This rhythmic manipulation of time foregrounds that enduring trauma and rebuilding life require equal parts acute presence and sustained perseverance.

Jon McGregor portrays Doc's post-stroke experience with a distinctive use of fragmented syntax and semantically broken language. The stylistic choice that mirrors the cognitive and linguistic effects of aphasia. After the stroke, Robert's ability to speak deteriorates sharply. The narration reflects this decline through

short, broken sentences and repetitions. They convey his internal confusion and linguistic struggle. The scene where Robert tries to communicate vividly illustrates it: *«I have difficulty speaking, but I can understand you. I have difficulty. I have hard, hard. I have difficulty speaking. I have hard speaking. But I can understand you. I am hard speaking but I can stand. Stand you.»*

The looping, garbled syntax, shifting between *«difficulty»*, *«hard»*, *«speaking»* and *«stand»*, evokes not only what Robert wants to say, but also his inability to organize it in a way others can follow. This exemplifies expressive aphasia: the thought is present, but the language collapses mid-transmission.

McGregor's technique is a natural evolution of the novel's earlier use of free indirect discourse and stream of consciousness. However, in this context, it ceases to be about emotional urgency. It becomes a direct simulation of neurological deficiency. The style dramatises not emotion, but dysfunction. In another moment of attempted conversation Robert answers a therapist's question with fragmented and repeated syllables: *«"Christ! Yes, yes. Wok. Wok. Ssss, song. Red. Christ!"»* Here, he struggles with recalling and pronouncing simple words, *«walk»*, *«sun»*, *«red»*. It is further emphasised how even basic vocabulary is now a battleground between intent and articulation.

These stylistic decisions not only render Robert's condition with empathy and precision. They also immerse the reader in the dissonance of a broken mind attempting to find a way to function. The style becomes more than a narrative device. It is a method of experiential storytelling. It lets us feel the frustration, limitation and loss that define Robert's inner life after the stroke.

Jon McGregor continues his use of free indirect discourse in *STAND* to remarkable emotional effect, particularly in portraying Robert "Doc" Wright's struggle with aphasia. Even when Doc cannot speak fluently, this narrative mode allows readers to remain intimately connected to his inner world. The tension between intention and expression is thought to become one of the means of the novel's emotional impact in this part. It reveals that Doc's survival now depends not on physical strenght, but on cognitive resilience and emotional endurance.

Even when Doc's speech is distorted or incoherent, the narration makes his thoughts momentarily lucid. During a speech therapy session, he appears confident and competent inside his mind, despite the words coming out in a form of hodgepodge: *«"Four? Yes, that's great. Four suits in a deck of cards. Okay. And can you tell me the three words I asked you to remember just now?" / Robert looked at her, and at Anna. / "Yes, yes, obviously, of course. Christ!"»* There is a contrast between the ease with which he wants to respond and the distorted actual output. When asked to repeat the words *«walk, sun, red»*, he responds: *«"Christ! Yes, yes. Wok. Wok. Ssss, song. Red. Christ!"»* He clearly knows the answer and his intention is intact. However, the means of expression fail him. The reader experiences this disjunction first-hand, not as clinical observation but as intimate emotional experience. McGregor depicts the internal state with clarity even when the surface expression breaks down. Later, as Robert tries to assert authority in a

group setting, he becomes visibly bothered by his limitations: *«He looked at Anna. His hand lifted, and dropped. He moved his eyes from side to side. A series of expressions moved across his face, refusing to settle.»* This moment epitomises the paradox: Robert's personality, insight and urgency are present, yet remain partially inaccessible, not only to others, but sometimes even to himself.

The risk, then, is not death by cold or isolation, but something subtler and more devastating. It is the threat of being misunderstood, erased, or permanently unheard. As Anna reflects on his condition, the narration states plainly: *«It was important not to make assumptions about cognitive ability based on levels of communication.»* McGregor uses free indirect discourse to reach through that barrier. He offers a portrayal that is both clinically realistic and emotionally immersive. This narrative strategy turns Robert's internal struggle into something readers do not just witness. They are able to feel it.

Jon McGregor's prose deliberately fractures in *STAND*. It echoes the very rupture of memory and cognition that Robert "Doc" Wright endures after his stroke. The earlier storms used sharp syntax and sudden stops to show physical breakdown. Similarly, the hospital scenes mix and clash, merging past and present as Robert tries to piece together his thoughts.

For example, Robert's story falls apart in therapy when he tries to describe the storm: *«"Gone. Gone. All white," he said. "See, see. See nothing. Storm."»* His attempt to describe a single event loops back on itself, words stuttering and repeating (*«"Gone. Gone…See, see"»*), then trailing off into raw sensory impressions. Time fractures too: the storm "hits" while he is both kneeling now and remembering being hurled against the table. Present action and past trauma collapse into one another.

Even in moments of relative calm, his memory falters: *«He didn't know how long he had been down. Couldn't recall getting on the skidoo and pointing it up to the plateau. Some kind of muscle memory.»* Here, the narration slides from present observation (*«He didn't know…Couldn't recall»*) into an abstract reflection on *«muscle memory»*. This underlies the gap between bodily habit and conscious recollection.

This stylistic choice highlights a key struggle: survival isn't just about fighting cold or storms. It's about reclaiming your sense of self from a fog of disconnected thoughts. Language is a battleground for Robert. He gathers fragments and reorders syntax, just like he reshapes his memories. Through these jagged, overlapping lines, McGregor immerses us in that slow, uncertain reconstruction of mind.

Jon McGregor deliberately alternates between Robert's fragmented interior world and Anna's exhausted, fiercely devoted caregiving perspective. He transforms the "struggle for life" into a shared ordeal of psychological endurance.

From Anna's viewpoint, survival takes the form of relentless daily rituals and the weight of constant vigilance: *«She had to leave him in the armchair while she went down to the kitchen, and she had to make him promise not to move. She*

had to listen out for any crashes or noises while she sliced an apple, and spread toast, and made tea. She had to ignore the phone while she ran the breakfast tray upstairs. She had to cut the toast into small pieces so he could eat it. She had to count out his tablets while he was eating, and tick them off.» Each gesture underlines her devotion and the emotional fatigue building beneath.

As the weeks wear on, Anna's burden intensifies. She finds herself fielding calls from Luke and the Institute, rearranging visits, wrestling with household chores and work emails, and juggling administrators' forms: *«By the end of the week she had to ask Sara to come and help, just for a while. It was too much. She didn't think she could do it all on her own. She resented having to say this aloud.»* In that moment, guilt and frustration surface. She is the caregiver who vowed to be unflappable must confront her own limits.

Anger and guilt co-exist when Anna admits she doesn't want to take care of her disabled husband: *«"I don't know if I want him to come home," she said.»* It is a raw, unguarded confession of the emotional turmoil trauma inflicts on loved ones. This is an acknowledgement that loving someone through their worst moments can be as wrenching as enduring the injury itself.

Beyond tasks and resentment, McGregor also captures Anna's inner disorientation. In quiet interludes, she hears: *«There was a glow of electric light around the horizon. There was a roaring sound in her ears. She had the same dizzy sensation she sometimes got at the end of a long train journey. She felt ill-equipped, despite the preparations that had been made. She had questions she couldn't quite articulate. She sat and listened for any noises upstairs. She waited for the spinning to subside.»* The sensory overload (light, noise, dizziness) mirrors her mental overload. It makes her waiting-room existence nearly as fraught as her husband's hospital bed.

By shifting into Anna's perspective, *STAND* reminds us that survival after trauma extends far beyond physical healing. It encompasses the emotional endurance of those in the orbit of catastrophe. Those who must reorder their lives, bottle exhaustion and guilt, and find in their devotion a reason to keep going.

The author briefly shifts into the minds of peripheral figures: nurses, relatives, Institute officials. Each flash of perspective reframing survival through a different lens. Bridget, the nurse, shows professional detachment. She often tells Anna to speak like it's a medical test: *«Bridget always wanted her to talk. She was under the impression that Anna bottled things up.»* In Bridget's eyes, survival hinges on communication itself. If Anna would just verbalize her fears, healing might follow. Yet this clinical gaze contrasts sharply with Anna's exhausted loyalty. This highlights how caregiving requires more than technical competence.

Anna's daughter Sara offers a view of survival from the home front. She is fraught with worry and second-guessing: *«Sara called, and asked if she was okay. Why hadn't Anna answered her calls? Anna told her that Robert was in good hands. Did she know when they might be coming home? Anna didn't imagine it would be very soon.»* Sara's concern is emotional rather than clinical. She

measures survival in the promise of reunion, each unanswered call a fresh source of dread.

Brian, the Institute representative, brings the outside world's timetable crashing into the ward: *«Brian came to the ward and asked how Robert was doing. Everyone at the Institute sent their very best wishes. There was something he needed to say… It had taken longer than anticipated to locate and you could say extract the second of Robert's colleagues. He had very unfortunately passed, which is, passed away, during the flight back to Bluff Point.»* His role is to relay institutional imperatives and tragic news. This underscores survival as a matter of logistics and protocol.

By weaving in these brief shifts, the author reminds us that current survival isn not experienced in isolation. It reverberates through clinical concern, family anxiety, and organizational demand. Each perspective is a vital thread in the larger tapestry of endurance.

Jon McGregor's narrative in *STAND* pivots from the visceral immediacy of the Antarctic storm to a quieter, more existential form of survival during rehabilitation. In the storm, survival is measured in seconds: dodging ice blasts, battling wind, and scrambling for shelter. Afterward, it becomes a test of patience and identity. It is played out in slow speech exercises, chore-like caregiving tasks, and the effort to reclaim a fractured self.

Storm prose is kinetic: *«The wind was too strong to stand up in, so he edged forwards on his elbows and knees. Forwards and to the left. He called Luke's name, and heard nothing.»* Rehabilitation prose, by contrast, unfolds in lists and repetitions, almost ritual-like: *«She had to change the bedsheets in the morning because he'd made a mess of using the pan. She had to help him roll out of the bed and lever himself into the chair. She had to put a towel on the armchair because his pyjamas were still wet.»* Each *«She had to…»* sentence underscores the daily persistence required. It is not dramatic rescue, but the grind of love and duty.

Under storm conditions, broken radio chatter heightens danger: *«". . . this . . . again . . . out."»* During rehabilitation, language itself is the frontier: *«"Christ! Yes, yes. Wok. Wok. Ssss, song. Red. Christ!"»* Where once words were tools for coordination and survival, they now resist being spoken. Every syllable is an act of endurance, a small victory against cognitive erosion.

Surviving the storm means keeping your body upright. Surviving the aftermath means keeping yourself intact. When Robert struggles with his name: *«"My name. Is Robert. I am. Guide. Explore. I had stroke. I had a, I have a, aphasia. I am. Tech. Guide. I work. Ant, ant, ant."»* We see identity splintered. But each halting self-introduction is also a step toward reassembling that identity.

By these shifts in pace, perspective, language, and structure, McGregor redefines survival. No longer merely the avoidance of death, it becomes the art of living. To survive is to find meaning in fractured speech, in repetitive routines, in the quiet endurance of both patient and caregiver. Through *STAND*, survival is

revealed as persistence of the mind and heart when the familiar self has been irrevocably broken.

Conclusions and discussions

Thus, this study looks at how Jon McGregor's *Lean, Fall, Stand* uses language and style with narrative perspective. It shows the characters' struggle for survival as more than just an external challenge. Instead, it reveals a deep, emotional, and psychological journey. We started with the idea that McGregor uses a third-person narrator. The narrator often shifts focus. They use techniques like stream of consciousness and free indirect discourse. We believe this approach draws readers into the harsh realities of surviving in Antarctica. It also highlights the long struggle for identity and agency after trauma. Through our analysis, using the Leech & Short checklist and many examples, we showed that this hypothesis holds true in three key ways.

Firstly, McGregor uses third-person narration that shifts focus. This style offers a broad and detailed view of the storm. The text shifts easily between Thomas's confusion, Luke's hard choices and Doc's ironic thoughts. This creates an intense story about crisis. No character has complete control over the narrative. This distorted, multi-voiced structure shows how isolated each man feels. We, the readers, see the whole picture. This makes a survival is not just about facing wind and ice. It is also a contest of faulty perception and mixed training methods.

Secondly, in moments of great danger, McGregor uses stream of consciousness and short, clipped sentences. This style shows the characters' mental and physical breakdown. The rhythmic short and disrupted sentences like in *«Remain calm. Stay in place. Make contact.»* and the fearful looping of *«He should have stayed in place when the storm hit. He should never have moved.»* simulate the instinctive, narrowed thought-loops caused by hypothermia and panic. The study shows that syntactic and phonological disruption are not just stylistic choices. They serve as important mimetic tools. They translate interior breakdown into the language of the text. The result is an almost cinematic immersion: the reader's pulse quickens in accord with the characters' as each breath becomes a struggle.

Thirdly, the story goes from the chaotic *LEAN* section to the disastrous *FALL*. Finally, it changes to the steady *STAND*. All the time McGregor shifts his focus. He moves from external survival to internal. This includes psychological healing, language recovery and rebuilding the self. In these quieter passages, we observe how free indirect discourse and fragmented syntax evoke aphasia, memory lapses, and existential doubt: *«I have difficulty speaking, but I can understand you. I have difficulty. I have hard, hard. I have difficulty speaking. I have hard speaking. But I can understand you. I am hard speaking but I can stand. Stand you.»* The shift from immediate danger to the calm pace of therapy shows that the struggle for life goes on, even after the body feels safe. Identity, agency and meaning must be reclaimed. It is done one word and one gesture at a time.

Finally, these three vectors of analysis prove that our hypothesis was effectively confirmed. McGregor's sophisticated application of narrative perspective and voice does indeed create an emotional influence on the reader. It makes readers to inhabit both the physical extremity of the Antarctic and the interior extremity of trauma. Our research found certain places where the technique makes things more complicated instead of clearer. The very polyphony that expands our view can also distance us from a single emotional anchor. This suggests that narrative fragmentation is itself thematically integral: survival mitigates unity.

There are plenty of ways to apply the research results. First of all, building on our findings, scholars might undertake a comparative study of survival narratives across contemporary fiction. For example, examining how different authors deploy similar or contrasting narrative techniques. By mapping where ideas meet and differ, we can spot trends in how today's writers show resilience in tough times.

In addition, in line with empirical studies of literature (Zyngier et al., 2008; van Peer & Chesnokova, 2022), future research could test McGregor's affective strategies on actual readers. It could focus on measuring signs of empathy, tension, and cognitive engagement. This includes both physiological data and self-reported feelings. These experiments would put ideas like "reader immersion" into practice. They would also measure how changes in focalisation affect emotional impact.

Besides, educators in creative writing and translation programs can use *Lean, Fall, Stand* in their narrative voice workshops. Using targeted exercises in focalisation shifts, fragmentary syntax, and free indirect discourse could help students understand how form shapes affect. Translators might similarly benefit from guidelines on preserving polyphony and rhythm when rendering the text into other languages.

There can be various directions for further research. To begin with, utilizing eye-tracking and neuroimaging methods, researchers could investigate how readers process polyfocal narratives and fragmented sentences. This could shed light on the neural correlates of narrative immersion and disorientation.

Moreover, a comparative corpus study of non-Western survival tales might reveal different narrative conventions for representing elemental forces and inner resilience. This could open intercultural dialogues on the universal yet variable human confrontation with nature.

In addition, by applying stylometric and sentiment-analysis tools to a broad sample of survival fiction, one could identify quantitative patterns in the deployment of sensory vocabulary, pronoun shifts and syntactic complexity. This could provide macro-level validation of the micro-analyses presented here.

Subsequently, an adaptation study could explore which narrative strategies can be transposed into visual or performative modes—and which literary effects remain uniquely textual.

This research shows how narrative form turns an extreme environment into more than just a backdrop. It becomes a key player in the survival drama. The way the narrative voice breaks down and comes together reflects the characters' struggle to live, think, and speak. We show how McGregor's narrative techniques improve reader experience. This helps advance theory in narratology. It also has practical uses in teaching, adaptation, and reader-response studies. *Lean, Fall, Stand* shows how fiction can turn fear, isolation, and trauma into a deep exploration of survival.

References

1. Aćamović, B. (2019). Replenishing the Odyssey: Margaret Atwood's and John Barth's postmodern epics. *ELOPE, 17*(1), 41–55. https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.17.1.41-55
2. Auer, P. (2007). *Style and social identities: Alternative approaches to linguistic heterogeneity*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.
3. Bazzoni, A. (2024). Second-person narrative and relational ethics in Donatella Di Pietrantonio's *Mia madre è un fiume* and Ada D'Adamo's *Come d'aria*. *The Italianist, 44*(2), 386–401.
4. Bekhta, N. (2017). We-narratives: The distinctiveness of collective narration. *Narrative, 25*(2), 164–181. https://doi.org/10.1353/nar.2017.0008
5. Bekhta, N. (2020). *We-Narratives: Collective Storytelling in Contemporary Fiction*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
6. Butalia, U. (2019). Storytelling, caste, and agency in contemporary South Asian fiction. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing, 55*(1), 85–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449855.2018.1506081
7. Bracke, A. (2019). Living to tell the story: Characterisation, narrative perspective, and ethics in climate crisis flood novels. In *New Directions in Philosophy and Literature* (pp. 321–337). Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
8. Breger, C. (2018). Cosmopolitanism, controversy, and collectivity: Zadie Smith's networked narration. In *The Edinburgh Companion to Contemporary Narrative Theories* (pp. 81–98). Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
9. Brown, A. (2024). Narrative Technique (Point of View). *ResearchGate*, 1–10. Retrieved April 1, 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382276163_Narrative_Technique_Point_of_View

Bruhns, A., & Köppe, T. (2024). Internal focalisation and seeing through a character's eyes. *Estetika: The European Journal of Aesthetics, 61*(2), 126–141. https://doi.org/10.33134/eeja.364

10. Chaudhary, S. (2024). 4.IJOES-Distinctive narrative -(17-25) (2). *ResearchGate*. https://doi.org/10.47311/IJOES.2024.6.4.25

11. Chen, T., Fan, X., He, J., Fan, J., & Chen, W. (2024). When "I" or "S/He" uses the product: the impact of narrative perspective on consumers' brand attitudes in storytelling ads. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1338249

12. de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life* (S. Rendall, Trans.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

13. De Graaf, A. (2022). The role of identification and self-referencing in narrative persuasion. Communications, 48(2), 163–179. Retrieved October 15, 2024 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360227793_The_role_of_identification_and_self-referencing_in_narrative_persuasion

14. Dubi, Y. B. (2020). Analysis of narrative voice in Bonnie Winn's *Protected Hearts*. *Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, *20*(4). SSRN. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3665260

15. Ehrlich, S. (2014). *Point of View: A Linguistic Analysis of Literary Style*. Taylor & Francis

16. Farinde, R. O., & Oyedokun-Alli, W. A. (2021). Narrative voice structure in Kole Omotoso's *The Edifice*. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 10*(4), 100–105. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.10n.4p.100

17. Gayret, G. (2016). Lexical patterns of free indirect discourse in D.H. Lawrence's *Women in Love*. *Journal of Narrative and Language Studies, 4*(7), 17–29. Retrieved from https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jnls/article/view/14103

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

19. Green, M. C., & Brock, T. C. (2000). The role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*(5), 701–721. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.701

20. Gregoriou, C. (2023). Plotting and characterisation in Sophie Hannah's *The Other Half Lives*: A cognitive stylistic approach. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, *52*(1), 41–60. https://doi.org/10.1515/jls-2023-2004

21. Harris, Jesse A. and Christopher Potts. 2009. Perspective-shifting with appositives and expressives. Linguistics & Philosophy 32(6):523–552

22. Heiniger, A. K. (2023). The narrative voice and its comments: A quantitative and qualitative analysis of *Jómsvíkinga saga*. *European Journal of Scandinavian Studies, 53*(2), 328–353. https://doi.org/10.1515/ejss-2023-2015

23. Hilfling, J. (2024). A lodger returns: Change in narrative voice across epigenetic versions and works. In D. Van Hulle (Ed.), *Genetic narratology: Analysing narrative across versions* (pp. 55–72). Open Book Publishers. https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0426.04

24. Hoffmann, C. R. (2017). Narrative perspectives on voice in fiction. In M. A. Locher & A. H. Jucker (Eds.), *Pragmatics of Fiction* (pp. 159–196).

Berlin/Boston, Germany: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110431094-006

25. Huemer W. (2022). *Fictional Narrative and the Other's Perspective.* Università di Parma. Retrieved January 10, 2024 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363615166_Fictional_Narrative_and_the_Other%27s_Perspective

26. Igartua, J. & Guerrero-Martín, I. (2022). *Personal Migrant Stories as Persuasive Devices: Effects of Audience- Character Similarity and Narrative Voice.* Universidad de Salamanca. Retrieved January 17, 2024 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359257108_Personal_Migrant_Stories_as_Persuasive_Devices_Effects_of_Audience-_Character_Similarity_and_Narrative_Voice

27. Ikeo, R. (2022). Contemporary present-tense fiction: Crossing boundaries in narrative. Language and Literature. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/09639470221117674

28. Indriyanto, K. (2022). *Spatial Imagination and Narrative Voice of Korean- American Experience in Gary Pak's A Ricepaper Airplane.* Universitas Prima Indonesia. Retrieved January 17, 2024 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361638593_Spatial_Imagination_and_Narrative_Voice_of_Korean-_American_Experience_in_Gary_Pak%27s_A_Ricepaper_Airplane

29. Indriyanto, K., Perangin-angin, E., & Tan, M. C. (2023). Narrative perspective and imagined space: Understanding Japanese-American experience in Hawaii through Murayama's fiction. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *15*(2). https://doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v15n2.25

30. Jin, J., & Liu, S. (2024). The influences of narrative perspective shift and scene detail on narrative semantic processing. *Language and Cognition*, *16*(4), 1366–1394. https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2024.9

31. Kaiser, E. (2015). Perspective-shifting and free indirect discourse: Experimental investigations. *Proceedings From Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, *25*, 346. https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v25i0.3436

32. Kim, N., Kim, H. K., Wojcieszak, M., Igartua, J., & Lim, C. M. (2019). The presence of the protagonist: Explaining narrative perspective effects through social presence. *Media Psychology*, *23*(6), 891–914. https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2019.1665548

33. Lasersohn, Peter. 2005. Context dependence, disagreement, and predicates of personal taste. Linguistics and Philosophy 28 (6): 643–86.

34. Leech, G. N., & Short, M. (2007). *Style in fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. Pearson Education.

35. Maier, E. (2015). Quotation and unquotation in free indirect discourse. *Mind & Language*, *30*(3), 345–373. https://doi.org/10.1111/mila.12083

36. Marchand, M. (n.d.). *Gérard Genette : Narratology / Signo - Applied Semiotics Theories*. Signo - Louis Hebert. http://www.signosemio.com/genette/narratology.asp

37. Maxey, R. (2016). National stories and narrative voice in the fiction of Joshua Ferris. *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction, 57*(2), 208–216. https://doi.org/10.1080/00111619.2015.1019410

38. McGregor, J. (2021). *Lean Fall Stand*. Fourth Estate.

39. Naz, I., Qasim, Z., & Umar, A. (2025). Space and time: Narrative analysis of Najdi's selected short stories. *Journal for Social Science Archives, 3*(2). https://doi.org/10.59075/jssa.v3i2.224

40. Patel-Grosz, Pritty. 2012. (anti-)Locality at the Interfaces. PhD dissertation, MIT.

41. Potts, Christopher. 2007. The expressive dimension. Theoretical Linguistics 33 (2):165–98.

42. Rautela, B. (2021). The politics of representation: Caste in contemporary Indian fiction. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture, 6*(3), 42–50.

43. Sabur, A. J. S., & Sari, R. P. (2021). FOCALIZATION-NARRATOR EFFECT ON PERCEIVED LIKABILITY AND VILLAINY IN KEPNES'S YOU: A NOVEL. *The 9th Literary Studies Conference*, 60–64.

44. Salem, S., Weskott, T., & Holler, A. (2017). Does narrative perspective influence readers' perspective-taking? An empirical study on free indirect discourse, psycho-narration and first-person narration. *Glossa a Journal of General Linguistics*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.225

45. Siegenthaler, P., & Fahr, A. (2023). First-Person versus Third-Person. *European Journal of Health Communication*, *4*(3), 35–52. https://doi.org/10.47368/ejhc.2023.303

46. Siemes, M. (2023). Environmental activism in and through Imbolo Mbue's *How Beautiful We Were*. *Journal of Environmental Humanities, 15*(1), 1–10.

47. Stephenson, Tamina. 2007. Judge dependence, epistemic modals, and predicates of personal taste. Linguistics and Philosophy 30 (4):487–525.

48. Tahiri, L. (2020). *Lost in Translation: Narrative Perspective Silenced by the Voice of the Translator*. University of Prishtina. Retrieved January 17, 2024 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344777424_Lost_in_Translation_Narrative_Perspective_Silenced_by_the_Voice_of_the_Translator

49. Van Peer, W. and A. Chesnokova (2022). *Experiencing Poetry: A Guidebook to Psychopoetics*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

50. Velu, R., & Rajasekaran, V. (2024). "'This story must be told:' Unveiling environmental and social tapestry in Imbolo Mbue's *How Beautiful We Were*." *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11*, Article 1436. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03944-z

51. Xu, J., & Zhong, J. (2022). A study of authorial voice in *To the Lighthouse* from the perspective of feminist narratology. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research, 5*(6), 2067–2072.

52. Zyngier, S., Bortolussi, M., Chesnokova, A. and Auracher, J. (eds). (2008). *Directions in Empirical Literary Studies: In honor of Willie van Peer*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.