

Unreliable
conjectures based on
clues that are



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Unreliable narration is a technique where the narrator makes outrageous claims and gives endless justification for shocking acts. The writer employs the unreliable narrator because readers trust them for a while as the story proceeds before realizing that something is amiss. Garcia Marquez is an unreliable narrator because he has incomplete information and is also dishonest. Where can these narrators be useful? Probably to create horror or supernatural fiction. Mostly because readers make conjectures based on clues that are given by narrators who do not always accurately interpret events. Garcia tricks the readers in a way that the readers wonder increasingly about the truth of events described by him.

The report of events on the day of the murder provided by Marquez is ambiguous and he leaves the judgment up to the readers. The readers thus fail to understand that the narrator is not the final voice of truth, authority and confuse the narrator with the author. Garcia recollects the past in relation to the events through a technique called "back grounding" due to which he shifts the story back and forth.

It is also due to this that the story is not in a chronological order. The first chapter concentrates on Santiago's final minutes of life (line) while the second talks about the wedding night of Bayardo and Angela and her return to the house, the third concentrating on the decision of Vicario brothers to kill Santiago, the fourth dealing with Santiago's autopsy, report of the murder and leaving of Bayardo and Angela's family from the town while the fifth deals with the neutral reactions of the townspeople regarding the murder. To fictionalize the story from the beginning, he clarifies what personality and features characters have and talks about their relationship with one another,

the kind of life they live and eventually supporting events of the main event. In literature, the narrative I is neither stable nor unified rather it is split and fragmented. One can read or “hear,” this disintegration in the multiple voices through which the narrator voices in the text.

Garcia wasn't an eyewitness to the crime which inevitably means that he would have to combine autobiographical and fictional elements. He would thus shift the focus from what happened to how it happened. We see that the narrator has exact details about minor things like the time as far as Santiago's movements are concerned. He gathers minor bits of information, which do not contribute much to the story.

As the book progresses, a new voice adds to our composite knowledge of the events of the day of the murder, also revising and undermining the information which has preceded it. The narrator tricks the readers by repeating and diverting towards minor things that do not actually contribute much to the development of the crime revelation. He also uses memory to trick the readers. He admits that “I had a very confused memory of the festival before I decided to rescue it piece by piece from the memory of others” (Marquez, 43).

The evolving narrative I combines both the factual and fictional details that belong to felt history and in turn dominates Garcia's autobiography because what interests him is not the description of the event but the subjective impression it made on him and how he looked at it and lived it. The novella is structured according to open pluralities of temporalities. The narrative moves back and forth, mixing interviews with the accounts of the narrator,

who returns to the town only after 27 years of the murder, to “ put the broken mirror of memory back together from so many shards.” (Marquez, 5)

From the beginning till the end, it is evident that something is going to happen, Santiago had to be killed by Angela’s brothers as he deflowered her which appears to conform to the journalistic style of narration that is commonly characterized as ‘ what, who, when, where, whom, how and why’ technique. This means that the readers are informed in advance about what is going to happen for instance the opening..., when, where and to whom will it happen.

However, it is ironical that Santiago himself is unaware of the fact that he is going to be killed. This means the why of his death is not very clear. This prolepsis adds to the narration of the story at a point before the mentioning of the early events.

The narrator, Santiago Nasar , Luis Enrique, and Cristo Bedoya are very good friends , it is ironical that nobody observe anything implicating about Santiago’s demeanour. Santiago spends most of his last hours with his friends trying to compute the exact cost of the wedding celebrations.

The narrator reminisces: “ I was with him all the time in the Church...all the more so such a big secret.” The narrator’s observations cannot be considered decisive. As we proceed, it is revealed that the narrator has a sensual connection with Maria Alejandrina Cervantes. However, this was kept a secret from Santiago as the narrator didn’t want to wound his friend’s feelings. The novel repeatedly dents the authority of the narrator through such observations. However, the narrator does not realize that if he can keep a secret from his friend, the obverse is also possible.

Marquez exaggerates the happenings. The narrator manages to locate 322 pages of the original 500 page brief prepared by the investigating magistrate. He appears to be a man well versed in literary texts and undermines his legal document with notes in the margin that verge on the lyrical. The magistrate is "perplexed by the enigma that chance had touched him with.

" (Marquez, 100) Like a good portion of investigative journalism the story creates inquisitiveness about the way in which the murder will be carried out. The narrator collects details which convey the imprint of a thorough documentalist: "After their sister revealed the name to them... a half inches wide." (Marquez, 50-51) However, the collection of details is never unintentional. The description about Ibrahim Nasar's house, descriptions about the gifts brought by guests at Bayardo and Angela's wedding, are suggestive of the lofty position relished by both Bayardo and Santiago.

The callousness of Santiago's killing is brought to the forefront by the realistic autopsy report. The narrator keeps up the reportorial style by recording the exact time and every movement of Santiago on the day of his murder: "Furthermore; all the many people... a beautiful day." (Marquez, 2) "The public spree... with Santiago Nasar five hours before killing him."

(Marquez, 45) Does this vigilant documentation of facts help the narrator decode Santiago's demise? Or does this tactic of Marquez divert readers' attention from the real cause? The journalistic style is prudently cultivated only to uncover its complete scantiness as a way to comprehend Santiago's demise. The narrator undermines his own attempts by uniting the idiosyncratic impression of the characters. However, his own observations are also recorded.

When he finally encounters Bayardo about whom he read in his mother's letters, he writes: "I met him...he seemed like a very sad man to me." (Marquez, 27). Most of the time, the subjectivity edges on the surreal for instance, when Santiago dressed in white clothes, crosses the square on his way to the docks so as to welcome the bishop: "Clotilde Armenta, the proprietress of the establishment...He already looked like a ghost," she told me." (Marquez, 13) Garcia utilizes magic realism in relation to a suspension of disbelief. He vividly describes events that do not contribute much to the story, suspending the reader's belief.

For instance, the description of the rifles that he kept in his closet, the description of how "the bullet wrecked the cupboard in the room" passing through the dining room" all lead to the suspension of disbelief. Another particular event which exemplified this was when Santiago exclaims "Don't be a savage," "Make believe it was a human being" upon seeing Victoria Guzman throwing the insides of the rabbits to the panting dogs. This scene is meant to bring the reader into the story and have us feel what the character was feeling. Therefore, by doing this it suspended our disbelief.

Thus, by doing this Garcia is successful in making his readers believe in something surreal. Marquez's writing is so complicatedly fastened with surreal concepts that it has defined the genre of Magic Realism. He illustrates a world so implausible that it is impossible to understand what is real.

Nonetheless, questions of discerning the truth in his novel will never stop being asked. However, Marquez achieves his original intent of using opinion

and perception to create ambiguity. Though “ There had never been a deathmore foretold” (Marquez, 50) it could be claimed that the statement would be wellread as There has never been a death more muddled.