

Subsidiary Characters in Select William Gillette's Play

Aaradhana

MA Student at
Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University,
Katra, India

&

Dr. Amitabh V. Dwivedi

Asst. Prof (Linguistics)
amitabhvikram@yahoo.co.in

Abstract

Contemporary literature and recent media studies have taken so much from the genre called "Sensational Novels", that even though this genre emerged in the late nineteenth century, it became hugely popular in the twentieth century, and also drew the attention of the present generation. The Detective fiction first presented to the world by Wilkie Collins, was introduced during the time when the concept and performance of the great detective and the sensation genre was blooming. One such work which became popular during that time was the narrative by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle centering on Sherlock Holmes. The aim of this paper is to examine the intriguing characters which Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and William Gillette constructed in the play of Sherlock Holmes. This consultant detective laid its impact on the readers in the nineteenth century, when it was first published, but even in the present times it had not lost its charms. The character of Sherlock Holmes became a sensational figure, due to which it had been the center of research by the scholars; however, the minor characters were studied seldomly. The paper with the help of Narratology, seeks to examine the William Gillette's play; wherein, to show that the minor characters are essential for the development of the main protagonist, the narrative of the subsidiary characters will be analysed.

Keywords: Narratology; Sherlock Holmes; Characters; Sensation Fiction.

Introduction

The present paper consists of analysis of the play *Sherlock Holmes: A Drama in Four Acts*, which William Gillette wrote by taking inspiration from the novels of Conan Doyle. The protagonist, Sherlock Holmes was a great success for the last hundred and twenty-five years and have attained the title of the most popular fictional character in the past, and even in the contemporary times. Due to which, the character of Sherlock Holmes in the work of Conan Doyle, have been studied rigorously, as his convoluted character was difficult to understand; and to

decode the reasons for why this fictional narrative became so popular. The subsidiary or the minor characters due to this very reason, somehow remained under the shadow of the grandeur of the Sherlock Holmes. To bring forth the minor characters, the paper will do a narratological investigation of these minor characters. The minor characters that will be discussed from the play *Sherlock Holmes: A Drama in Four Acts* are Alice Faulkner, Madge Larrabee, John Larrabee, Professor Moriarty, Forman, etc.

Sherlock Holmes: A Drama in Four Acts was played for first time on October 23, 1899, at the Star Theatre in Buffalo. The producer of the play was Charles Frohman, the music was given by William Furst and the scene was designed by Ernest Gros. The play was one of its own kind during that time because the scenes in the play were changed by using lightening (“Dramatic and Musical”,1889). William Gillette created all the characters of the play, except the character of Sherlock Holmes; Watson; and Moriarty. The whole play was written by Gillette, but still Doyle was credited as a co-author because the plot of the play was largely inspired from Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes series, that even some dialogues in the play were lifted from the original stories.

Hypothesis

The main protagonist is important for a narrative, as the whole story revolves around him/her, but so are the minor characters as they also contribute in the advancement of the story building and are necessary for the development of the main protagonist.

Research Objective and Question

Theoretical Background

To find out the meaning of a given text, firstly it is important to know about the role of the reader. According to the reader-response theory, it is the reader who while doing the act of reading, interprets a text and gives meaning to the text (Davis & Womack, 2002, pp.59). The role of the reader is important for analysing the characters as it is the reader’s own experiences that he/she uses to interpret a text while reading it (Davis & Womack,2002, pp.61). Therefore, there is possibility that each time a text is read, the reader might be able to find some new character traits due to the influence of the personal experiences. The issue related to the subjectivity while reading a text can be solved by making the reader aware of it and by not categorizing the reader. Seymour Chatman points out that the characters and the plot can exist independently in the mind of the readers, as many a times we recall fictional character vividly, but fail to remember the text from which the character became alive, this is how the readers remember the character (Chatman,1978, pp.118). The reason for the independent existence of the character is because of the mimeticⁱ nature of the characters (Phelan,1989, p.2).

Secondly, it is important to throw some light on the debateⁱⁱ of whether character is more important or the action is more important in a narrative analysis. It was Aristotle who fist

The minor characters in the narrative of Sherlock Holmes do not enjoy as much attention and popularity as the main protagonist. To bring to the light the minor characters of the play *Sherlock Holmes: A Drama in Four Acts*, the paper hinges on following research question:

What is the role of the minor characters in the play *Sherlock Holmes: Drama in Four Acts*?

Scope and Limitations

The paper studies minor characters and argues that they are as important as the major ones in the development of a narrative. So, the paper puts them in the forefront while analyzing Gillette’s play. Also, the paper employs popular Models of Forster, Ewen, Greimas, and Fokkelman as a conceptual lens to analyse them. The structure of the narrative has been given more importance than the interpretation. At the surface level though the paper seems simple but it is not simplistic because it talks about margins, and how marginals are important in the formation of the center- a very contemporary debate in the present day critical theory.

gave the contrast between character and action, and according to him, action is superior to the character, as he stated in his *Poetics* that a play does not act so that characters can be presented to the readers, instead the narrative characters are included in a play for the sake of action (McKeon, 1947, pp.632). But there were other writers such as Leslie Stephen who believed that character is superior to action; according to him it was the narrative action that was responsible for the disclosure of character. But we cannot deny the fact that character and action cannot be treated separately. We cannot say for sure that character dominates the narrative or that it is the other way around, but one thing that we are sure of is that it is difficult to discuss the character than action. As the action is the unfolding of an event in a story (Abbott, 2002, pp.123-25). The actions of the characters are easy to explain and analyse, whereas characters are hard to analyse because of their uncertain natureⁱⁱⁱ. This should not affect the scholars from investigating the characters.

The essence of narrative character

Characters were considered as fictive people as they were created by the author, and for Barthes in his *S/Z* (1970) characters were not related to a real person but were mere words in a narrative. Tzvetan Todorov called these textual entities as “a mass of signs” as the text and the characters are together by naming these characters. Character was considered to perform a specific task on discursive. This was one view about the character but there are other theorists who opposed this structuralist’s view point.

The characters were becoming more distinctive with richer description and separate with the rise of novels in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. James Phelan defines the characters in a narrative to be both synthetic and mimetic^{iv} (Phelan, 1989, p.2-3). Phelan calls the characters synthetic for being artificial as they are the fictional characters. Even though the narrative character is the construct of the writer, but they still constitute some, but not all realism as they depict the problems similar to the real people (Rashkow, 1993, ppp.106). The narrative character is the reflection of the human^v aspect, this very reason makes them mimetic. Moreover, by giving names to the narrative characters makes them closer to the real life and mimetic in nature (Reinharts, 1993,

ppp.119). The characters perform different roles in narrative and these roles further help to set different characters apart (Prince, 1982, pp.72). More or less, a character has similar qualities to that of real people, and the degree of resemblance to the real person helps in distinguishing the characters from one another. The status of main and secondary characters differs because of the realism perceived in characters along with their frequent appearances in the text (prince, 1982, pp.72)

Models of narrative character

To interpret a narrative, the readers need to fill in the gaps and how they fill in the gaps determine what is the meaning of a text (Hatavara, Hyvarinen, Makela, & Mayra, 2015 pp.55). But the causative chemistry inside the narrative is hard to determine as what goes inside the character is impossible to figure out unless it is informed by the writer. Readers have to deduce the insight of the character of their own. For analysing the character and determining the description of the character, it is necessary to categorize them. There have been many literary critics who gave various models for the characterization of the narrative character. The models given by E. M. Forster, Ewen, Greimas, and Fokkelman^{vi} have characterized the narrative character in their own way and

have their own values and defects. Without choosing any one amongst these, the paper will use these models altogether eclectically for the analysis of minor characters in *Sherlock Holmes: A Drama in Four Acts*.

Forster's Model. Forster classified the narrative character into two types flat and round characters. The flat characters were called "humorous" in the nineteenth century (Forster,1927). The flat characters were singular in action, without concealed complications (Abbott,2002, pp.126). The flat characters were constructed to follow a single idea. The flat characters are convenient for the author because these characters do not need to be introduced again; moreover, there is no need to track the progress of these characters as they develop in their separate atmosphere. The flat characters are easy to remember by the readers, because they do not change during the different circumstances in the narrative (Forster,1927). Whereas, the round characters are opposite of the flat characters. According to Forster the round characters cannot be defined in one phrase like the flat characters, since the round characters are full of varying complications and intensity. The round characters are considered superior to the flat characters by the critics because of the complexity in the round characters which makes them closer to the real person.

Ewen's Model. Joseph Ewen classified characters on the basis of three axis which were complexity, development

and penetration into the "inner life" (Kennan, 1983, pp.41-42). This model is very subjective, as the interpreter is responsible for setting the guidelines for determining the characters. Characters have varying depths, as there are characters which only show single trait. These characters are fixed and are viewed from the outside in a narrative, whereas, on the other hand are the characters with complexity and development, which are viewed in a narrative from inside out (Brown,2015). Ewen's classification keeps in the mind the depth of the characters.

Greimas Actant Model. Greimas gave the concept of actants and acteurs which are similar to action or activity. Actant is the role in a particular plot structure, which operates inside the logical composition of the plot. Greimas generalized the approach of Propp on Russian fairy tales with his actant model in which he categorized all the narrative characters into three binaries opposites: subject and object, sender and receiver, helper and opponent. The one who performs these actant roles is the acteurs and acteur can perform more than one actantial role, which means that different characters at the same time can perform a particular actantial role (Kenan,1983, pp.37). However, the actantial model has its drawbacks as it will difficult to define the how readers will be presented with particular perception of each character in a narrative (Bal, 1997, ppp.118).

Table. 1
Classification Model of Characters

Models	Classifications
Forster	Flat And Round
Ewen	On the basis of Complexity, Development, and penetration into inner life.
Griemas	Subject, Object, Sender, Receiver, Helper, Opponent.
Fokkelman	Heroes, Opponent, and Helper.

Fokkelman's Model. Fokkelman in his 1981 model classified narrative characters into three types as heroes, opponents and helpers^{vii}. For Fokkelman hero is the character which is important for the text as he/she is the center of the adventure^{viii} and shows initiative. Whereas he defines opponents and helpers by their action of helping or making things difficult for the hero. This model also helps in analyzing the characters in a narrative.

How to Define a Character

The character in a narrative is introduced to the readers in many different ways. And if one wishes to analyse and define the characters of a narrative, he/she should first recognize those different ways in which a character is introduced. Furthermore, for analysing a character one needs to first examine its character traits^{ix} (Toolan, 1988, pp.93). Leitch points out that when we view characters on the basis of their traits, the character immediately reduces in its depth and memetic nature (Leitch, 1986, ppp.157); moreover, it is the dominant traits of the characters in the narrative which can be used for describing a character in a finest way (Rashkow, 1993, pp.105). To discover these dominant qualities, one needs to see how the author presents the characters to the readers in the narrative, that is by direct characterization or by indirect characterization. Direct characterization is either done by the narrator or by other characters in the narrative, while the indirect characterization involves the readers to draw a logical conclusion from the actions of the character in the narrative (Bal, 1997, ppp.129)^x. When the author describes a character, the information we get is trustworthy, but the characterization given by the other characters is not that reliable (Bar-Efrat, 1989; Tolmie, 1999, pp.42). The author or the other characters give direct characterization of the narrative character

either by mentioning the character in a detailed manner, or by giving a psychological description of its feelings and thoughts (Bar-Efrat, 1989, pp.63). And the indirect characterization as mentioned earlier is done by analysing the speech or the way the characters act in the narrative. The speech of the character can lead to know about traits of the person who is speaking and about the person to whom the speaker is speaking (Bar-Efrat, 1989, pp.70). For analysing a character, one should note how the character makes a response when a speech is directed at them (Bar-Efrat, 1989, pp.73) and compares, how the narrator (or some other character) describes an event in a narrative from the perspective of the character (Bar-Efrat, 1989, pp.76). Indirect characterization is done by a chief component, that is the actions of the character in the narrative, no matter if it is the minor one.

While analysing the character it is important to think about whether the act by the character is necessary or he/she has some other options too, one needs to think of the other possible ways in which a certain act could have been performed; and also considers if it is necessary for the character to act in such a way (Tolmie, 1999, pp.44). The action of the character gives us the glimpse of the value he/she has. It is possible that a certain act can have varying interpretations, in that case the act needs to be looked objectively for understanding the values of the character. Minor characters also help in indirect characterization, as they are responsible for making the qualities of the main character to stand out (Bar-Efrat, 1989, pp.86). As Simon says that the personality of the main character is highlighted by comparing them with the minor characters indirectly (Simon, 1969, ppp.226-227).

The above-mentioned ways of characterization when used together with

uncovering the traits by direct or indirect characterization, along with different models of narrative character will help in

analysing the subsidiary characters in the play *Sherlock Holmes; A Drama in Four Acts*.

Character Analysis

Alice Faulkner

The character of Alice Faulkner is based on the role of Irene Adler from *A Scandal in Bohemia* by Conan Doyle, which shows a glimpse of the love life of Sherlock Holmes, as it has not been discussed in his canon (Eyles, 1986, pp.34). Alice is introduced to the readers in the Act I when Madge asks James to come up with different strategy to find out the code of the locker in which the evidence is kept, without using the force.

MADGE (quickly): Yes—but wait, Jim. (LARRABEE stops and turns to her.) (She goes near him.) What’s the use of hurting the girl? We’ve tried all that! LARRABEE: Well, I’ll try something else! (Turns and goes to archway.)

MADGE (quick, half whisper): Jim! (LARRABEE turns, MADGE approaches him.) Remember—nothing that’ll show! No marks! We might get into trouble (Gillette, 1899).

From the above-mentioned excerpt, it can be deduced that Alice is a strong and determined woman, as she does not break down no matter how much she is tortured by the Larrabee couple, who have held her captive along with her mother. She remains strong through the tough times, when she is beaten and starved. She is pure hearted as she knew that the evidence would bring the end for the person who caused the death of her sister or even fortune if it were used for blackmailing him. But she desires no such thing of those evidence, instead tries so hard to keep them to herself no matter how much pain she had to endure for it. All that she intends is not revenge but punishment, for the person who caused the death of her sister. Though it is reflected in her dialogue

below that she only wishes to warn the family who is planning to tie knot with such a person.

ALICE:....There are other things beside revenge—there is punishment. If I am not able to communicate with the family—to which this man proposes to ally himself—in time to prevent such a thing—the punishment will come....(Gillette,1899).

Alice is brave as she tricked the Larrabee couple by changing the lock’s code and even hiding the evidence knowing the result of her action. She stays strong and never once shows her weak side. She is always upfront when she is asked to tell the location of the evidence which she hides away. As it is proven from the excerpt below:

ALICE (low voice—slight shake of head): You needn’t tell me, I know well enough.

MADGE: (pause. ALICE looks at Madge calmly. No defiance or suffering in her expression.)

(Comes closer and speaks with set teeth.)

Do you hear! We want to know what you’ve done with them.

ALICE (low voice—but clear and distinct): You will not know from me (Gillette, 1899).

It is evident that Alice maintains her poise when she is threatened and replies calmly without feeling scared. Moreover, Alice is a naïve person, she could not see the intentions of the people around her, as when Madge pretended to be her friend, she could not decipher the motive behind her friendship and opened her heart in front of her which led her into a big trouble.

MADGE: I picked her up, of course, and sympathized and consoled. I invited her to stay with me at my house in London.

Jimmy came over and took this place — and when I brought her along a week later it was all ready — and a private desk safe for the letters and jewellery (Gillette, 1899).

Moreover, Alice could not even understand the plan of Sherlock Holmes who intentionally returned the package of evidence back to her. As all he wanted is, to gain her trust.

HOLMES (speaks hurriedly): Now that you think it over, Miss Faulkner, you are doubtless beginning to realize the series of tricks by which I sought to deprive you of your property... You see, Miss Faulkner, it was a trick—a deception—to the very—end (Gillette, 1899).

But Alice could not understand that and fell for him instead. Love of Alice for Sherlock is also sincere, as she even went to warn him of the plan which James Larrabee had planned with Moriarty of killing Sherlock Holmes. She knew that it would be dangerous as it is evident from the excerpt mentioned below:

LARRABEE: Oh — to warn him very likely?

ALICE: Yes. (Pause.) To warn him (Gillette, 1899).

This shows that she is courageous enough to put her life at risk for the one she loves. And in the end, she even gives up the one thing that she has been fighting for from the beginning to protect Sherlock Holmes. She gives the package of the evidence to the owner, just to help Sherlock Holmes.

Alice Faulkner is the center of the narrative and can be considered the driving force of the play. The character is a round character if we consider the classification made by Forster. This character is a dynamic, as she has progressed and changed through the narrative. From being captive for two years and not taking any major steps to free herself, to warning Sherlock is one big step which shows how the character of Alice Faulkner has developed in the

narrative. One can also say that the character of Alice is foil to the character of Sherlock Holmes, her innocence and sincerity is opposite to the sharp and genius mind of Sherlock Holmes. The complexity and psychological depth in the narrative of the character of Alice Faulkner makes it one of the main characters on narratological grounds.

Professor Robert Moriarty

Professor Moriarty is the antagonist of the play. He is a middle-aged man, with high intellect. Professor Moriarty's physical description is given in the introduction of the Act 2 scene 1 as follows:

He is a middle-aged man, with massive head and grey hair, and a face full of character, overhanging brow, heavy jaw. A man of great intellectual force, extremely tall and thin. His forehead domes out in a white curve, and his two eyes are deeply sunken in his head. Clean-shaven, pale, ascetic-looking. Shoulders rounded, and face protruding forward, and for ever oscillating from side to side in a curiously reptilian fashion. Deep hollow voice (Gillette, 1899).

The character of Professor Moriarty is modelled on a real life criminal Adam Worth. Conan Doyle created the character of Professor Moriarty to kill Sherlock Holmes in his stories, but in the adaptations like this play Professor Moriarty plays a significant of Sherlock's archenemy^{xi} and is given much more importance. Professor Moriarty is introduced in Act I. He is the mastermind of all the illegal works in London and Sherlock Holmes is tracking him down to catch him. Due to this very reason Moriarty wants to kill Sherlock Holmes and is looking for any case through which he can get to Sherlock Holmes. As it can be seen in the following excerpt:

PRINCEMoriarty is king of 'em all in London. He runs everything that's shady — an' 'Olmes 'as been settin' lines

all round 'im for months —... an' now he's beginnin' to find out that 'Olmes is trackin' 'im down — and there's the devil to pay. 'E wants any cases 'Olmes is on — it's a dead fight between 'em! 'E'll take the case just to get at 'Olmes! 'E'll kill 'im before 'e's finished with 'im, you can lay all you've got on it (Gillette, 1899).

The police can't harm him in any way because it is difficult to catch him; moreover, there are not enough evidences to prove his crime. Professor Moriarty is so powerful that even if someone comes up to report against him, that person would not survive to speak against him. Even the police are scared to take any actions against professor Moriarty. Moriarty is a kind of underworld king as it is shown in following excerpt:

PRINCE: ... He sits at 'ome — quiet and easy — an runs nearly every big operation that's on. All the clever boys are under him one way or another — an' he 'olds them in 'is 'and without moving a muscle! An' if there's a slip and the police get wind of it there ain't never any 'old on 'im. They can't touch him. And wot's more, they wouldn't want to if they could.
MADGE: Why not?

PRINCE: Because they've tried it — that's w'y — an' the men as did try it was found shortly after a-floatin' in the river — that is, if they was found at all!... (Gillette, 1899).

Professor Moriarty is aware of the talent of Sherlock and desperately wants to get rid of him. Moriarty is a quick-witted mastermind, as he at once found out that the Forman is involved with Sherlock. He is ruthless as he without any hesitation orders to kill the Forman, just to get Sherlock Holmes. Moriarty is a master criminal who plans all the killings, without getting his hands dirty.

MORIARTY: I have a suggestion to make. (All turn in surprise and look at MORIARTY.) The first thing we must do is

to get rid of your butler — not discharge him — get rid of him. (To BASSICK.) Craigin for that! To-day! (Gillette, 1899).

Moriarty badly wants to get rid of Sherlock Holmes and wants to do it himself.

BASSICK: You will go there yourself sir!

MORIARTY: I will go there myself — myself (Revolver out) I am the one to attend to this (Gillette, 1899).

Professor Moriarty is a round character, because of his importance to the narrative, moreover this character can also be categorized as the opponent in the narrative, the term given by Fokkelman. Since, it is the character of Professor Moriarty, that have been waiting all along to interfere in any case, which Sherlock Holmes is on. Professor Moriarty being rival of Sherlock Holmes played the role of opponent in the narrative. The character of Moriarty is important for moving forward the narrative and also developing the strong and impressive character of the main protagonist Sherlock Holmes. This character can be considered the most well-defined character by the author, as Professor Moriarty is the only character whose physical appearance was given by the author, to help make readers the picture of the villain.

The Larrabee Couple

The couple Madge Larrabee and James Larrabee are the con artist, who deceived innocent Alice for their own profit. Madge takes the advantage of the situation of Alice and pretends to be her friend. They both are cruel as they mistreated innocent Alice and her mother. They both are greedy enough to make a person who is suffering already suffer more. As they knew the condition of Alice, after her sister died, they still treated her like a prisoner and captivated her for two years. Madge Larrabee did show her concern, when she asked James not to torture Alice anymore and think of another

way to make her speak up. All they care about is to get as much profit as they can, no matter what way they were to take. The greed of James is evident when he makes the deal of the evidence with Sherlock Holmes.

To categorize the character of Madge Larrabee and James Larrabee, it is better to consider them as flat characters, who only had one motive in the play, to gain profit. The character of Larrabee couple do not develop in the narrative and can also be categorized under being sender according to Greimas, as it is because of the Larrabee Couple the whole quest for the evidence started. The Larrabee couple have no depth or complexity in their character and certainly are not round character. They can be classified under flat character, because of their static nature.

Other Minor Characters- Billy, Forman.

Forman. Forman is an undercover butter planted by Sherlock Holmes at the Larrabee's resident. He follows the order of Sherlock Holmes. Forman is a loyal servant of Sherlock, who tries his best to help his master as he informs Sherlock of the counterfeited package, which Moriarty had planned to trap Sherlock. He is strong enough to help himself out of any situation, as when he was attacked by Moriarty's men.

Billy. Billy is the young attendant of Sherlock Holmes who plays the role of messenger in the narrative, as he announces the arrival of the people, do errand work for Sherlock, and even spy on people. It was Billy who informed Sherlock about where Moriarty was hiding and even disclosed that Moriarty was disguised as taxi driver. Billy is shown as courageous and smart, as he manages to run away when he is being captured by the Moriarty's men. And he even without any hesitation took out the gun out of the pocket of Moriarty. He is obedient and listens to every need of Sherlock.

The character of Billy and Forman comes under the category of helper along with the other flat characters as they played important role in the background of the narrative by helping the main protagonist with his quest to retrieve the evidence package. They both are the static character and good servants of Holmes. These characters do not have any depth, nor do they show any complexity. These characters are not round because not much has been informed to the readers about these characters, either by the author, or through the narrative.

Conclusion

The subsidiary characters are important for the narrative and play a significant role for the development of the main protagonist. The characters in the play are open to the imagination of the readers. As the appearance of most of the characters is not defined by the author. All the characters which have been analysed above are mimetic in nature as they reflect the real-life features of humans. All the characters are characterized on the basis of their action in the narrative. The minor characters help in the formulation of the character of

Sherlock Holmes, the main protagonist. As the opposite traits of these characters make the main protagonist superior from the rest, and highlight the character of the hero.

These minor characters are important as they introduce the readers to the characters as Professor Moriarty was introduced to the readers by the character of Paul. These characters also help the readers inform about the background of the story (Humpage,2016), as it was the Larrabee couple who let the readers know about Alice Faulkner and the story of her sister. The

minor characters help to fill the blank spots. The conflicts and tension created by these

characters help in the development of the plot. For instance, the subplot by Professor

Table. 2
Role of Characters in Accordance to Models

Models of Classification	Alice Faulkner	Prof. Moriarty	Larrabee Couple	Forman and Billy
Forester	Round	Round	Flat	Flat
Ewen	Complex	Complex	-	-
Fokkelman	-	Opponent	-	-
Greimas	-	-	sender	Helper

Moriarty to kill Sherlock Holmes, helped create a lot of tension and lead to a lot of action whereby, the home of Sherlock was burned down to ashes, Watson's clinic was under surveillance, which created suspense and moved the story forward. Hence the minor characters are equally important factors for the popularity of any narrative, as

the minor character work with the main protagonist instead of bringing him/her down. How these characters act and react with the main protagonist, help in the development of all the characters in the narrative (Humpage,2016). Hence, every character plays a significant role in the narrative.

© **Aaradhana Rajput & Amitabh Vikram Dwived**

Aaradhana Rajput is currently pursuing her Master's Degree in Arts from Shri Mara Vaishno Devi University, India. Further, she is working on research Subsidiary Characters in Select William Gillette's Play, under the able guidance of Dr. Amitabh Vikram Dwivedi, who is Head of School of Languages and Literature.

Amitabh Vikram Dwivedi is Assistant Professor of Linguistic and the Head of the School of Languages & Literature at Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University, India. His research interests include language documentation, writing descriptive grammar, and the preservation of rare and endangering languages in South Asia. He has contributed research papers to many academic journals. As a poet, he has published more than 100 poems in different anthologies, journals and magazines worldwide

References

- Davis, T.F., & Womack, K. (2002) *Formalist Criticism and Reader-Response Theory*. Palgrave.
- Dwivedi, A.V.(2016). Cognitivism, *The Sage Encyclopedia of Online Education*.(Vol. 1, pp. 133-135), Sage Publications Inc.
- Dwivedi, Amitabh V., (2016). Behaviorism, *The Sage Encyclopedia of Online Education*. (Vol. 1, pp-133-135), Sage Publications Inc
- Dwivedi, Amitabh V., (2009) *On Interrogating Language and Cognition*, Language in India, Volume: 9, Number 9, pp. 155-166.
- Chatman, S.& Phelan, (1980) *Story and Discourse: Narrative structure in fiction and film*. Cornell UP.
- Phelan, J. (1989) *Reading People, Reading Plots: Character, Progression and the Interpretation of Narrative*(ppp.118). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Abbot, H. P. (2002). Chapter 10. *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative* (ppp.123-125). Cambridge university press.
- Rashkow, I. N. (1993). In Our Image We Create Him, Male and Female We Create Him. *Semeia 63: The Effect of Biblical Characterization.*, (ppp.105-113).
- Reinhartz, A. (1993). Anonymity and Character in the Books of Samuel. *Semeia 63*, (pp.117-141).
- Prince, G. (1982). *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative*. Berlin: Mouton Publishers.
- (1889, November 8). *Dramatic and Musical: William Gillette as Conan Doyle's Wonderful Detective*.
- Hatavara M., Hyvarinen M., Makeela M., & Mayra F., Eds. (2015). *Narrative theory, literature, and New media: narrative minds and virtual worlds*. Routledge.
- Forster E. M. (1927) *Aspect of the Novel*. Edward Arnold
- Kennan R. (1983) *Narrative Fiction*, Routledge.
- Brown W. P., (2014). *Wisdom's wonder: character, creation, and crisis in the bible's wisdom literature*. Eerdmans.
- Bal M. (1997). *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (2nd ed.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- Fokkelman, J. P. (1999). *Reading Biblical Narrative: An Introductory Guide*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Toolan, M. J. (1988). *Narrative : A Critical Linguistic Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Leitch, T. M. (1986). *What Stories Are: Narrative Theory and Interpretation*. London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Efrat S. B., (1989). *Narrative Art in the Bible*. Sheffield: Almond Press.
- Tolmie, D. F. (1999). *Narratology and Biblical Narratives: A Practical Guide*. San Francisco: International Scholars Publications.
- Simon, U. (1969). Secondary Characters in the Biblical Narrative. Peli, P. (Ed.). *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies
- Eyles A. (1986). Sherlock Holmes: A Centenary Celebration. (p.34). Harper & Row.
- Humpage, (2016, March 12). The Importance of Supporting Characters [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://allwritefictionadvice.blogspot.in/2016/03/the-importance-of-supporting-characters.html>
- McKeon R. (Ed), (1965). *Introduction to Aristotle*. McGraw-Hill Education

ⁱ This mimetic nature is discussed in the section 'The essence of the narrative character'.

ⁱⁱ Abbott (2002, ppp.123-124) also gives a brief information related this debate in his book.

ⁱⁱⁱ As Bar-Efrat stated that characters are nothing more than how they are described in a literary work (1989, pp.48). This statement of him don't consider character's the mimetic nature, the very reason which makes readers interested in the characters. Hence, we cannot accept his statement.

^{iv} Phelan also gave third component of character, that is they are 'thematic' in nature, which means that characters also reflect a certain social class (1989, pp.2-3).

^v Since the characters are the reflection of humans, that is why there is not a single theory of character till the date that completely satisfies the scholars (Bal, 1997, ppp.115).

^{vi} Another theorist who classified character is W. J. Harvey, he simply categorized characters as protagonists and the background characters; and the characters that are more elaborated than the background characters he called them 'card' and 'ficelles'.

-
- ^{vii} One should note that the hero here does not necessarily know how to distinguish right from wrong (Fokkelman, 1981, pp.82).
- ^{viii} There can be many adventures and heroes in a single narrative.
- ^{ix} Toolan oversimplifies the analysis of characters by stating that traits of characters can be either positive or negative (1982, pp.72).
- ^x Can also see Prince (1982, pp.72)
- ^{xi} According to Merriam Webster dictionary an archenemy is the principal enemy of someone or something.