



The Frog That Swallowed the Nightingale: Invisible Power and the Architecture of Discourse in Vikram Seth's Fable

Maitreyi MansukhBhai Kher

Master of Arts (English)

Department of Languages

Bhakta Kavi Narsinh Mehta University, Junagadh

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21032371>

Abstract:

This paper explores how Vikram Seth's poem "The Frog and the Nightingale" beautifully illustrates Michel Foucault's ideas about power and discourse. While most readers see the poem as a simple story about a manipulative frog and a naive bird, this research argues that something far more subtle is happening. The frog never physically harms the nightingale or forces her to do anything against her will. Instead, he controls her by controlling the very rules of their world. He decides what counts as good singing, who has the right to judge talent, and what success means. The nightingale willingly accepts these rules because she does not realize they are designed to serve the frog's interests. Through a careful analysis of the poem using Foucault's archaeological method, this paper shows that the frog's power works through discourse—the invisible structures of language, authority, and knowledge that shape what can be said and done. The nightingale's tragedy is not simply that she trusts the wrong person, but that she becomes trapped in a system that defines her very identity as a singer, performer, and commodity. By the end, the frog has not only destroyed her physically but has also rewritten her story, dismissing her as "a stupid bird" and erasing all evidence of his exploitation. This reading reveals that Seth's fable is not just a moral lesson for children but a profound commentary on how power becomes invisible, how subjects are created through discourse, and how domination works most effectively when it is not recognized as domination at all. The paper concludes by suggesting that we too live in systems of invisible power, and that recognizing these structures is the first step toward freedom.

Key Words: *Power, Discourse, Vikram Seth, Michel Foucault*

Introduction:

The frog and the Nightingale is a simple fable where we can just find a story of manipulation. The nightingale's death in poem is a quiet one. She does not fall from a great height, nor does she scream. She simply stops singing. The other creatures of Bingle Bog, who once admired her voice, do not mourn for long. The frog delivers his verdict—"But she was a stupid bird"—and the world moves on.



The frog never forces the nightingale to do anything. He never threatens her, never silences her, never physically harms her. He simply praises her, offers advice, and organizes opportunities. She accepts everything willingly, even eagerly. Her destruction is not the result of coercion but of consent. She participates in her own destruction because she cannot see the structures that are ruining her.

The frog's power is not exercised through force but through discourse—through the invisible rules that determine what can be said, by whom, and under what conditions. He does not silence the nightingale; he gives her a voice. But it is a voice that can only speak in ways that serve him. He does not exploit her talent; he constitutes it, defining what counts as talent, how it should be evaluated, and who has the authority to evaluate it.

Michel Foucault's *The Archaeology of Knowledge* provides a startlingly precise vocabulary for understanding this invisible domination. Foucault shows us that power operates not through overt force but through the anonymous, rule-governed practices of discourse itself. Power is not something that is held and wielded by a sovereign subject; it is something that is produced, circulated, and reproduced through the very structures that make communication possible. The subject is not the origin of discourse but an effect of it—a position opened by discourse that individuals may occupy.

This paper argues that Seth's poem is a perfect dramatization of Foucauldian discourse theory. The frog establishes the rules that govern what can be said and sung in Bingle Bog; he positions the nightingale within a field of possible subject positions; he transforms her singing from an aesthetic practice into a commodity; and ultimately, he ensures that her voice can never challenge his authority because it is constituted through that authority. The nightingale's tragedy is not that she is naive but that she is caught in a system that makes her complicit in her own exploitation.

The implications of this reading extend far beyond literary interpretation. If we can see how the frog's power operates through discourse, we can begin to see how power operates in our own lives—through the institutions, practices, and assumptions that shape what we can say, think, and be. The frog is everywhere, and his power is most effective when we do not recognize him.

1.1 Objectives:

1. To analyze how a dominant figure builds and sustains discursive authority by defining what counts as appropriate speech, who may speak, and which practices are valued.
2. To uncover how invisible discursive mechanisms transform talent or expression into a marketable commodity, making domination appear natural and inevitable.



1.2 Methodology:

This paper applies Michel Foucault's theory of power from *The Archaeology of Knowledge* to analyze Vikram Seth's poem "The Frog and the Nightingale." The study uses Foucault's method of examining how discourse works as a practice that builds objects, places subjects in certain positions, and sets rules for what can be said and done. The poem is the main source, while Foucault's ideas provide the framework for analysis. The research follows four steps: looking at how objects like music and talent are created, examining who has the power to speak and judge, exploring how ideas like success are defined, and studying the choices available to speakers. This approach helps uncover the hidden power relations within the poem's language, showing that control works best when it is invisible. The study is a purely textual analysis with no human subjects or data collection involved.

2 The Architecture of Discourse: How the Frog Became Invisible

2.1 Defining Music and Talent in the Poem

The frog has been singing in Bingle Bog for so long that his authority appears natural, inevitable. He has made himself the sole enunciative authority, the figure who decides what qualifies as valid discourse. When the nightingale arrives, her beautiful voice threatens this monopoly. The frog's response is not to silence her but to incorporate her into his discursive formation on his own terms.

The nightingale's singing is not the same object when it is evaluated by the frog as when it is heard by the other creatures. The frog redefines it, subjects it to his grid of specification. He transforms her beautiful voice from a natural gift into a raw material that requires his expert processing. He constitutes her singing as an object that exists for him, that is defined by his standards, that has meaning only in relation to his authority.

2.2 The Formation of Enunciative Modalities: Who Has the Right to Speak?

In Bingle Bog, the frog has established himself as the sole authority on musical discourse. He is the critic, the teacher, the impresario. He occupies the position of the speaking subject who defines the terms of evaluation. The nightingale, by contrast, is positioned as the student, the performer, the object of evaluation. She speaks only in response to his prompts, only within the framework he has established.

Foucault argues that "the subject of the statement should not be regarded as identical with the author of the formulation." The nightingale is the author of her singing, but she is not the subject of the discourse. The subject is the position she occupies—the position of the student, the performer, the commodity. This position is defined by the frog, and she fills it without question. She accepts the frog's authority because she has no alternative framework for understanding her own talent.



2.3 The Formation of Concepts: Redefining Improvement and Success:

When the frog dominates and train the nightingale, he redefines improvement as conformity to his standards. The nightingale believes she is improving, but she is merely becoming more predictable, more reliable, more profitable. Nightingale loses its spontaneity and beauty because it is being shaped to fit the frog's criteria. She does not see that the concept of improvement she is pursuing is a trap.

When a frog is in charge and teaches a nightingale he changes what improvement means to fit his ideas. The nightingale thinks she is getting better. Really she is just doing what the frog wants every time. She becomes more dependable and useful, to the frog. The nightingale loses its spark and charm because it is being molded to meet the frogs standards. The nightingale does not realize that the kind of self-improvement she is trying to achieve is actually a trick. She is a nightingale and her beauty lies in her uniqueness but the frogs idea of improvement is making her change. The frogs standards make the nightingale more predictable. The nightingale is becoming what the frog wants her to be. The concept of improvement the nightingale is chasing is not really helping her. It is actually making her lose her self.

Similarly, the frog redefines success as commercial approval. He organizes concerts, sells tickets, and makes the nightingale perform on demand. She believes she is succeeding because she is admired and remunerated. She does not see that she has been incorporated into a system that extracts value from her while progressively exhausting her. Her success is her destruction.

2.4 The Formation of Strategies: The Commercialization of Song

The frog's most significant strategic move is to transform the nightingale's singing from an aesthetic practice into a commodity. Foucault argues that discourse is "an asset—finite, limited, desirable, useful—that has its own rules of appearance, but also its own conditions of appropriation and operation." By commercializing the nightingale's singing, the frog subjects it to new rules of formation. It must be repeatable, predictable, profitable.

This transformation is invisible to the nightingale because it appears as success. She does not see that she has been entrapped into a system that extracts value from her while progressively exhausting her. Her singing is no longer hers; it has been alienated from her life, turned into a commodity that ultimately consumes her. Foucault writes that "discourse is not life: its time is not your time; in it, you will not be reconciled to death." The nightingale's singing has been severed from her living presence.

2.5 The Architecture of Invisible Power

What makes the frog's domination so effective is its invisibility. He always works in a hidden secret way. He never threatens the nightingale, never forces her to do anything against her will. His power works not against her desire but through it, channeling it into channels that serve his interests. Foucault argues that power is productive rather than merely repressive. It "incites, it induces, it seduces, it makes easier or more difficult."



The final, cruelest act of the frog's power is his verdict after her death: "But she was a stupid bird." This is not merely a dismissal; it is a retroactive redefinition. It erases the entire history of exploitation and reframes the nightingale's tragedy as a failure of individual judgment. She was not a victim of systemic power; she was simply inadequate. The frog's power is so complete that it can even rewrite the past, ensuring that no one will ever see the truth of what happened.

Conclusion

Seth's poem is not merely a moral fable about manipulation; it is a profound dramatization of how power operates through discourse. The frog's domination is invisible because it is not experienced as domination; it is experienced as pedagogy, as opportunity, as the natural order of things. The nightingale does not rebel because she cannot see the rules that govern her existence—she can only see the positions that those rules make available to her.

Foucault's archaeology provides the conceptual tools to make this invisible domination visible. The nightingale's death is not a tragedy of individual weakness but a symptom of a discursive formation that could only accommodate her talent by destroying it. In the end, the frog does not merely control what the nightingale does; he controls who she is. Her identity as a singer, her sense of her own talent, her understanding of what constitutes success—all of these are shaped by the discursive rules that he has established.

References:

Primary Text:

National Council of Educational Research and Training. *English: Textbook for Class X*. NCERT, 2022.

Secondary Text:

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith, Routledge, 2002.

Khokhar, Muhammad Ibrahim, et al. "The Stylistic Study of the Narrative Poem 'The Frog and the Nightingale' By Vikram Seth." *Social Science Review Archives*, vol. 3, no. 4, 2025, pp. 1855–1862.

Poonguzhali, A. *Anthropomorphism in Vikram Seth's Poem 'The Frog and the Nightingale'*. *Language in India*, vol. 11, no. 6, June 2011, pp. 182–188

Certificate No.: 04072026028



**MULTIDISCIPLINARY COSMOPOLITAN JOURNAL OF RESEARCH
(MUCOJOR)-2583-9829 (On-line)**

International Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal

CERTIFICATE OF PUBLICATION

The Board of Multidisciplinary Cosmopolitan Journal of Research
(MUCOJOR) is hereby awarding this certificate to

Maitreyi Mansukh Bhai Khet

In recognition of the publication of the paper entitled

The Frog That Swallowed the Nightingale: Invisible Power and the Architecture of

Discourse in Vikram Seth's Fable

Published in Volume 04, Issue 07, June 2026.

EDITOR IN CHIEF