

SYNERGETIC CONCEPT OF THE GENRE SYSTEM

Chyk D. Ch.

INTRODUCTION

For the first time studying the genre as a certain composition system with the comparative method usage was suggested by the Russian folklorist V. Propp in his famous work “Morphology of the Tale”¹. The scientist considered the magical fairy tale genre (the most common and most typical kind of fairy-tale genres) as a system with the corresponding structure – the nomenclature and attributes of the characters that perform certain functions. Characteristically, understanding the magical fairy tale genre as a system, V. Propp emphasized its openness to other systems, that is, it demonstrates a synergistic interpretation of the genre: the genre can undergo certain metamorphoses with the obligatory preservation of the stable attributes, *the core*: “Real life creates new, bright images that crowd out fairy-tale characters, influenced by the current historical reality, influenced by the epic of neighbouring peoples, influenced by both written language and religion, both Christian and local beliefs”². Consequently, other systems, like specific historical moments, languages, religions, cultures, ideologies, can influence the genres and define the genre “new face” and change it.

By V. Propp, the artistic world of a magical fairy tale is a reflection and transformation of the important components of past human societies – as an example; one can draw the initiation ritual, constantly present in fairy tale plots. Thus, the plot and the composition of magical fairy tale are conditioned by social conditions – at a certain stage of social development, the rebirth of myth in the fairy tale occurs, “the “profanation” of sacred text begins”³. Hence the symbolic significance of the ceremonial action, initially “laid down” in the text, loses meaning for future generations – “uninitiated” recipients. However, the exclusive

¹Пропп В. Я. Морфология волшебной сказки. Научная редакция, текстологический комментарий И. В. Пешкова. Москва : Лабиринт, 2001. 192 с.

²Пропп В. Я. Морфология волшебной сказки. Научная редакция, текстологический комментарий И. В. Пешкова. Москва : Лабиринт, 2001. С. 80.

³Пропп В. Я. Исторические корни волшебной сказки. Научная редакция, текстологический комментарий И. В. Пешкова. Москва : Лабиринт, 2000. С. 315.

emphasis on the historical processes' influence on the formation of folklore genre structures with the rejection of both psychological and contactological aspects was not entirely justified, although it fully coincided with the Marxist interpretation of the interdependence of art, world outlook and religions from economic relations.

The work of G. Gachev "The Accelerated Development of Literature"⁴, written on the basis of the author's thesis (1958), became an extraordinary event for the literary criticism process. Firstly, it presented a completely different view from the Marxist literary critique of literary evolution, and, secondly, offered not only a specific, as it seemed, an approach to the peculiarities of the development of Bulgarian literature of the 1st half of the 19th century – but also a completely universal methodological model for the analysis of other Eastern European and Asian literatures that due to these or other historical and social reasons lagged behind the European literary tendencies.

Nowadays researchers notice the importance and relevance of the application of the methodological concept of G. Gachev for the analysis of other epochs' literatures. For instance, the Russian literary critic N. Ivanova noted the "latent" extrapolation of G. Gachev's ideas to the Soviet literature, which, in accordance with well-understood realities, developed in a way different from that of Western Europe. In the early 1990s, a cultural explosion in the post-Soviet literatures took place, which led to a rapid and intense recovery of lost aesthetic spaces, which, by the way, was not always successful⁵.

In the paper I will try to outline the modernity of the methodology proposed by G. Gachev for genological researches conducted in the framework of synergetics. Thus, G. Gachev's monograph "The Accelerated Development of Literature" is considered as one of the works that reveals a synergistic understanding of the development of literary processes at the levels of origin, development and decline of genres and genre systems.

The accelerated development of literature suggests the formation of a certain amalgam, which is created by the national literature tradition and the ideas of other literatures perceived by it. The study of a particular case, as G. Gachev suggests, will allow seeing the world-wide laws of literary evolution that are less noticeable if they are viewed only

⁴ Гачев Г. Д. Неминуемое: Ускоренное развитие литературы. Москва : Худож. лит., 1989. 430 с.

⁵ Иванова Н. Свободная и своенравная или бессмысленная и умирающая? Заметки об определениях современной словесности. *Знамя*. 2012. № 7.

as an illustrative material⁶. G. Gachev proclaims the *sudden evolution surges* of national literatures not as atypical and “exotic” cases, but as certain points of the world literary coordinate system.

1. The Concept of “Genre System” in the Prism of Synergetics

The concept of “genre system” in the synergetics’ prism implies a new understanding of the system – as the formation of elements that are in complex interconnections. As is well known, it is the revolutionary departure from the understanding of the system as a closed set of elements to the consideration of the system as an open structure, which allowed scientists to evaluate the general laws of the phenomena functioning and processes in various sciences in a new way. So the interdisciplinary direction – synergetics – is based on accepting and interpreting the phenomena of nature and culture as open dissipative systems, for which there are persistent structures that arise as a result of self-organization. These systems represent a certain object class in systems belonging to various sciences and are conditionally deterministic, since under certain conditions it is impossible to predict their behaviour⁷. The consideration of genre systems in fiction with the use of such a new methodological reflection will allow us to answer not only questions about the structure features, but also about the openness of genres and their ability to perceive external and internal influences.

The synergy methodology, evolving first within the framework of cybernetics and the general systems theory, has undergone several evolutionary stages, and is now often identified with not only the research direction, but with a separate science and even worldview. The mathematical terminology of synergetics is a combination of results from many areas of theoretical physics (indeed, and the founder of synergetics H. Haken is a theoretical physicist). Today, several theories are distinguished within the synergistic researches – *dynamic chaos theory* (B. Mandelbrot, Ya. Sinai, B. Chirikov), *catastrophe theory* (V. Arnold, E.C. Zeeman, B. Malgrange, R. Thom), *the theory of turbulence* (A. Kolmogorov, Yu. Klimontovich, A. Obukhov) and others. The achievements of representatives of *the open systems concept* (L. von Bertalanffy, G. Schedrovitskyi) and *the dissipative structures theory* (H. Hermann, G. Nicolis, I. Prigogine) were important for the

⁶ Гачев Г. Д. Неминуемое: Ускоренное развитие литературы. Москва : Худож. лит., 1989. С. 11.

⁷ Капица С. П., Курдюмов С. П., Малинецкий Г. Г. Синергетика и прогнозы будущего. Изд. 3-е. Москва : Едиториал УРСС, 2003. С. 23.

development of synergetics. The activity of these and other scientists made it possible to create a methodology not only for the exact sciences, but universal one, suitable for application in the spheres of humanities. Synergetics as a science began its development with a mathematical justification of the key positions and studies of physical, chemical and biological systems. Thus, the laws to which I. Prigogine came in his studies of non-equilibrium thermodynamics, including the theory of dissipative structures (for which, incidentally, he received the Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 1977), subsequently began to successfully apply to other open systems.

The transfer of synergetic studies' findings into other disciplines, and accordingly into studies on other systems, caused understandable fears that a superficial understanding of mathematical principles and an artificial implementation of dissipative systems could be wrong and destructive. However, today, the researches of open systems in societies, cultures and literatures are not uncommon, since the research of systemic laws is directed not only at the past or the present, but also at the future, since it allows us to predict the ways of developing these or other phenomena. An example of this is the concept of G. Gachev because of its synergetic directions, as we have already noted, based not only on the author's researches, but also on the possibility of its use in relation to other literatures and the epochs of the past and the future.

In order to avoid the "blurring" of the synergetic methodology, an approach that maintains the "conceptual genome" of synergetics is particularly productive and thus forms a discipline that differs from its "authentic" version with a mathematical base⁸. This makes it impossible to turn synergy into a certain scholastic dogma and to apply the corresponding science methods only where they can indeed produce objective results. At the same time, without taking into account the conceptual foundations of "traditional" synergetics, such studies are bound to pseudoscience and bias. A combination of systemic and synergistic approaches, which should not be opposed to each other, can be productive⁹. V. Vasilkova predicts the division of synergetics into two distinct scientific directions: the actual synergetics, which will be related only to the fields of natural sciences, and the second direction,

⁸ Буданов В. Г. Синергетическая методология в постнеклассической науке и образовании. Синергетическая парадигма: синергетика образования : коллективная монография. Отв. ред. В. Г. Буданов. Москва : Прогресс-Традиция, 2006. С. 181–182.

⁹ Зинченко В. Г. и др. Словарь по межкультурной коммуникации: понятия и персоналии. Москва : Флинта, 2010. С. 108–109.

associated with the extrapolation of the theoretical model of systems self-organization for humanitarian and social spheres worked out¹⁰. It is this research direction that includes the synergetics' use to study traditional literary criticism problems. Though, there are still not many works that demonstrate the practical synergetics' usage of in the literature study, but they already outline a broader perspective for applying the synergetic methodology to the literary phenomena analysis in the widest range of areas.

Another important work of G. Gachev is "The Humanitarian Commentary to Physics and Chemistry"¹¹, in which he reinterprets the key concepts of the natural sciences. It is not for nothing that the preface author, the well-known populariser of synergetics S. Kurdyumov, in the context of the problems raised in the book, mentions the work of I. Prigogine and I. Stengers "Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature", which also raised the idea of a holistic understanding of the world, which is possible only through future common approaches in natural sciences and humanities¹².

One of the main ideas of modern synergetics is identical to the defining principle formulated in the 1920s by the Russian economist and philosopher O. Bogdanov: a system is not organized in itself, but only in relation to certain activities, while it can be in relation to others disorganized or neutral one¹³. This principle, not enough perceived during the scientist's life, today is self-evident: any systems are to one or another degree organized structures, and all phenomena, regardless of their essence, are structures and sets of many elements. In the framework of studies on thermodynamics I. Prigogine proved and formulated an important postulate of synergetics: in the case of large deviations from the equilibrium position, the initially stable state of the system may lose its equilibrium, which is the first step towards the establishment of a dissipative structure¹⁴.

G. Gachev, answering a question that could stimulate such deviations in genre systems, outlines a number of factors that provoked

¹⁰ Василькова В. В. Порядок и хаос в развитии социальных систем: (Синергетика и теория социальной самоорганизации). Санкт-Петербург : Лань, 1999. С. 18.

¹¹ Гачев Г. Д. Гуманитарный комментарий к физике и химии. Диалог между науками о природе и о человеке. Москва : Логос, 2003. 512 с.

¹² Гачев Г. Д. Гуманитарный комментарий к физике и химии. Диалог между науками о природе и о человеке. Москва : Логос, 2003. С. 9.

¹³ Богданов А. А. Тектология: (Всеобщая организационная наука). В 2-х книгах. Редкол.: Л. И. Абалкин (отв. ред.) и др. Москва : Экономика, 1989. Кн. 1. 1989. С. 23.

¹⁴ Пригожин И. Конец определённости. Время, хаос и новые законы природы. Ижевск : НИЦ «Регулярная и хаотическая динамика», 2000. С. 55–68.

and created a situation in which the entire change of the Bulgarian literature genre system of the 19th century took place. In his opinion, these factors of influence coincide with the figures of prominent cultural figures that, in their multifaceted and syncretic creativity, were able to accomplish “centennial”, or even “millennial”, “jumps” – Saint Paisius of Hilendar, Saint Sophronius of Vratsa, Dr. Petar Beron, N. Gerov. A more or less synchronous alignment with the European literary process occurs only at the end of the 19th century, as, for example, in the work of the Realism representative, the Bulgarian literature patriarch, I. Vazov¹⁵.

Synergetics involves a number of attributes of dissipative systems. First of all, there are requirements for the openness of a nonlinear system, which should have many elements or subsystems. The dissipative system is in a state of instability, in a state far from equilibrium¹⁶. Systems can also have subsystems at different levels. Thus, G. Gachev considers a literary work as one that can consist of multilingual systems¹⁷. Languages, being materialized by a worldview with their own logic, are capable of interpenetration: in particular, in the Ukrainian literature of the 1st half of the 19th century such examples are seen in the works of I. Kotliarevsky, G. Kvitka-Osnovianenko, Ye. Grebinka and others.

The system openness implies the source availability and “drains” for the exchange of energy with external environments, which, in fact, structures the system and helps to maintain its orderliness. The order in the systems is supported by *attractors* – the certain stable states, which the system searches for after receiving external influences. Russian scientists S. Kurdiunov and E. Kniازهva come to conclusions about the archetypal nature of synergetic processes in culture. Considering the concept of attractors in the broad anthropological sense, as the orientation of the behavior of an open nonlinear system, they take into account understanding them as “goals” of a definite final stage of evolution. The term “attractor”, as it turns out, had its prototypes in ancient philosophical systems – eidos of Plato, the ideas of Aristotle, and others like that. In the human psyche attractors are Jungian archetypes¹⁸.

¹⁵ Гачев Г. Д. Неминуемое: Ускоренное развитие литературы. Москва : Худож. лит., 1989. С. 426.

¹⁶ Князева Е. Н., Курдюмов С. П. Основания синергетики. Режимы с обострением, самоорганизация, темпомиры. Санкт-Петербург : Алетейя, 2002. С. 52.

¹⁷ Гачев Г. Д. Содержательность художественных форм. Эпос. Лирика. Театр. 2-е изд. ; послесловие В. А. Недзвецкого. Москва : Изд-во Моск. ун-та ; Изд-во «Флинта», 2008. С. 68.

¹⁸ Князева Е. Н., Курдюмов С. П. Основания синергетики. Режимы с обострением, самоорганизация, темпомиры. Санкт-Петербург : Алетейя, 2002. С. 82.

Accordingly, genre systems do not appear in the empty place – their creation is the result of transformation of “foreign” genres and has its own archetypal basis.

Genres depend on the evolution of artistic world outlook and are complicated along with the sophistications of existence and consciousness¹⁹. However, the genre basis, archetypal by nature, remains constant: even changing, the genre system retains its structure. In the process of accelerated literature development, the transfer of still “foreign” and geographically distant genres to their “national soil” is carried out. Genres are reinterpreted in a new coordinate system, receiving new content, driven by mentality and national character. Their original form is deformed and acquires the latest interpretations. G. Gachev gives an interesting example of how difficult it is to decode the genres of other peoples: “No wonder the interest in the content, hidden in the form, in the ways of the world vision, arose in European art history precisely at the turn of the 19–20 centuries, when the works’ flow of the peoples of the East and primitive peoples poured into European culture. Non-penetration of a strange form appeared as a cipher, as a set of symbols; they had to be mastered before interpreting further”²⁰.

The very principle of the development of self-organizing systems is important, which lies in determining the certain components’ behavior by certain factors – the so-called parameters of order (the word “order” here is semantically inaccurate, since the system exists due to chaos). The constituent elements of the system are in hierarchical bonds, which are determined by order parameters, which develop new space-time structures. However, the order parameters are the carriers of information about the system as a whole: defining them, one can speak about the state of complex systems. H. Haken defined the role of order parameters metaphorically: “... the order parameter is similar to the puppeteer who controls his puppets: he makes them dance, but they, in turn, have power over him and can manage it”²¹. Thus, the interactions between system parts and order parameters are determined by the obedience principle, but at the same time, the collective behaviour of the system “puppets” is capable of determining order parameters. It seems that the order

¹⁹ Гачев Г. Д. Содержательность художественных форм. Эпос. Лирика. Театр. 2-е изд. ; послесловие В. А. Недзвецкого. Москва : Изд-во Моск. ун-та ; Изд-во «Флинта», 2008. С. 65.

²⁰ Гачев Г. Д. Содержательность художественных форм. Эпос. Лирика. Театр. 2-е изд. ; послесловие В. А. Недзвецкого. Москва : Изд-во Моск. ун-та ; Изд-во «Флинта», 2008. С. 33.

²¹ Хакен Г. Тайны природы. Синергетика: учение о взаимодействии. Москва ; Ижевск : Институт компьютерных исследований, 2003. С. 23.

parameters in genre systems of literatures are language, national character, culture, history, tradition, imperial culture (for colonized peoples), and others like that.

Another attribute is the spontaneous activity of open systems, which arises as a result of a collision with external factors, depends on the system instability and causes deviations – fluctuations. I. Prigogine and his co-author I. Stengers describe this process as follows: “The problem of the stability of a system vis-a-vis this kind of change may be formulated as follows: the new constituents, introduced in small quantities, lead to a new set of reactions among the system’s components. This new set of reactions then enters into competition with the systems previous mode of functioning. If the system is "structurally stable" as far as this intrusion is concerned, the new mode of functioning will be unable to establish itself and the "innovators" will not survive. If, however, the structural fluctuation successfully imposes itself-if, for example, the kinetics whereby the "innovators" multiply is fast enough for the latter to invade the system instead of being destroyed-the whole system will adopt a new mode of functioning: its activity will be governed by a new "syntax."”²². Thus, any deviation in the system is an indicator and level of chaos. Intrusion of new elements in genre systems is possible also from non-literary systems – historical, social, cultural, and economic, etc.

Deviations in the system and disturbance of its stability are bifurcations, peculiar to alternative ways of development. These qualitative transformations or metamorphosis of objects occur when the parameters from which they depend are changing²³. The choice of the system evolution occurs at so-called “points of bifurcation”; as a consequence of new attractors’ activation – they lead the system to new states, which can be positive or negative. In genre systems, this evolutionary path determines the natural selection of genres: their vitality, successful implantation, renewal, or extinction.

2. Genres as Closed Systems of Texts: For and Against

Based on Bakhtin’s dialogic theory, the Bulgarian-French semiotician Julia Kristeva proposed applying a so-called *translingual approach* based on the concept of the literary genre evolution as an

²² Prigogine I., Stengers I. Order out of Chaos: Man’s New Dialogue with Nature. Bantam Books, 1984. P. 189–190.

²³ Арнольд В. И. Теория катастроф. 3-е изд., доп. Москва : Наука, 1990. С. 8.

unconscious exteriorization of linguistic structures belonging to different levels in the artistic text. The researcher identifies the sign system created by the genre with structural features of a language²⁴. The contribution of M. Bakhtin to the semiotic understanding of texts for Julia Kristeva is of paramount importance, since he considers the word (the minimum unit of text) on a qualitatively new level – as an integral component and expression of the dialogicity of the text, which implies the immanent presence of intertextuality.

The researcher determines the renunciation of the conservative rhetorical tradition of division into genres and the replacement of it with such an approach that would allow constructing a typology of texts based on their organization specifics as one of the main tasks of semiotics²⁵. The question arises, does such a proposal mean a complete departure from the traditional division into genres? The texts are included in the interaction, which involves the assimilation of other text structures or their retransmission. Such structures Julia Kristeva calls semiotic practices that are different depending on the level of subordination of the sign and denotation.

However, the use of such practices leads to a certain paradox. Julia Kristeva shows the practical application of her approach on the example of a novel, which now cautiously calls not a genre, but the text that is identified as the sign ideologeme, which can also be investigated using suprasegmental and intertextual analysis²⁶. However, due to Kristeva's ideas generalized and differential features of genres should be discarded, as well as the genre category, because all the texts are included in a single intertextual field of interchange and mutual enrichment. Thus, considering the well-known medieval text “Le petit Jehan de Saintré” by Antoine de la Sale, the researcher constantly uses the terms belonging to the rhetorical tradition – mainly “novel” and “epic”. So, in her case distinguishing an epic and a novel based on certain intertextual functions required using a traditional “unifying” term for the generalization of semiotic practices types.

The rejection of the genres seems to be a necessary condition for opposing the rhetorical tradition of a new, “logical” one, based on the

²⁴ Кристева Ю. Семиотика: Исследования по семанализу / пер. с фр. Э. А. Орловой. Москва : Академический Проект, 2013. С. 74.

²⁵ Кристева Ю. Семиотика: Исследования по семанализу / пер. с фр. Э. А. Орловой. Москва : Академический Проект, 2013. С. 46.

²⁶ Кристева Ю. Семиотика: Исследования по семанализу / пер. с фр. Э. А. Орловой. Москва : Академический Проект, 2013. С. 48.

idea of producing and combining statements (depending on the type of functions) within the text as a “closed ideologeme.” However, on the question of whether the following characteristic of a novel is different from the same characteristic of a story or a sonnet, the author of the chapter has not found an unambiguous answer in Julia Kristeva’s work: “The novel has a double semiotic status: it is a linguistic phenomenon (narration), as well as a discourse circle (writing, literature): the fact that it is the narration it is only an aspect – the prior one – of his fundamental peculiarity – to refer to “literature”²⁷. The main difficulty of this approach lies in the declared “closed” and deterministic structure of the art work. The genre is characterized by changes in its type, character, and functions in the evolution process, that is, the obvious is the genre openness as a system that is inherently changing under the influence of literary and extra-literary factors.

Trying to interpret the genres as closed systems of texts was criticized by Yu. Lotman. Traditional attempts by researchers to consider genres as distinct entities within closed historical systems, he strictly called illusions²⁸. The reception of the art work, as well as the perception of the genre, the researcher relates with the specific understanding of its features by the reader. The genre gives the text its simbology introducing an artwork in the system familiar to a reader. Understanding the text depends primarily on two factors: the achievement of *the unity of the coding systems* of the writer and the reader and *the unity of the natural language and cultural tradition*²⁹. Misunderstanding of the cultural tradition and the genre “inclusion” of the text into a certain literary system leads to a failure to implement the author’s intentions in the artwork.

Understanding the genre as a communicative system (the genre “promotes” the dialogue of the artistic work and the reader, and, therefore, with the help of the text – the author and the reader) implies the presence of a certain semiotic code that does not reliably transmit the cultural and historical specifics of the epoch, but is an author’s reconstruction or deconstruction of the genre formal-content parameters.

²⁷ Кристева Ю. Семиотика: Исследования по семанализу / пер. с фр. Э. А. Орловой. Москва : Академический Проект, 2013. С. 69.

²⁸ Лотман Ю. М. Культура и взрыв. *Семиосфера : Культура и взрыв. Внутри мыслящих миров. Статьи. Исследования. Заметки (1968-1992)*. Санкт-Петербург : Искусство–СПБ, 2010. С. 117.

²⁹ Лотман Ю. М. Внутри мыслящих миров. *Семиосфера : Культура и взрыв. Внутри мыслящих миров. Статьи. Исследования. Заметки (1968-1992)*. Санкт-Петербург : Искусство–СПБ, 2010. С. 219.

So, as the scientist emphasizes, the text is a collection of facts (in his opinion, essential and inevitable) selected by its creator, which acquires its significance and essence in reader or critic interpretations. It is important that these facts, chosen by the sender-writer, receive a wider meaning that was written in the text code after the interpretation process³⁰. Regardless of the communicator wish, they acquire semiotic significance and those facts which, while decoding, get their new meanings. Thus, the genre system is not only a system with a certain genre code, but a collection of texts with literary and non-literary semiotic connections, which outside the scheme of communication “author – text” in the new conditions “author – text – reader” are able to acquire a new semantics. In any case, the text itself is “mute” and becomes a communication participant only in reading process³¹. Taking into account the genre specificity of the text as a result of its “inclusion” in the genre system, and not as an autonomous form for the presentation of holistic, completed and closed text, avoids scattering of one of its important semiotic meanings. Similarly: reading a genre in a system of other genres allows seeing new text messages that cannot be traced in the analysis of an artificially isolated genre.

Borrowing from M. Bakhtin the dictum “memory of the genre,” Yu. Lotman analyses it specifically: in the genre structure there are communicative features, which are often derivatives from the previous literary epochs³². Thus, the structural features of genre systems are also messages’ carriers from the past, which, in the new conditions and context, are capable of generating new meanings. The accumulation of new communicative meanings makes it difficult to distinguish between existing and acquired genre features. As I. Smirnov observes, there is the easiest way for researchers to explore genre systems, analysing the early evolution stages, when history dynamics does not aggravate the genre interference. However, genre systems of new and newest literatures should be considered taking into account those factors which, regardless

³⁰ Лотман Ю. М. Внутри мыслящих миров. *Семиосфера : Культура и взрыв. Внутри мыслящих миров. Статьи. Исследования. Заметки (1968-1992)*. Санкт-Петербург : Искусство–СПБ, 2010. С. 337.

³¹ Лотман Ю. М. Мозг – текст – культура – искусственный интеллект. *Семиосфера : Культура и взрыв. Внутри мыслящих миров. Статьи. Исследования. Заметки (1968-1992)*. Санкт-Петербург : Искусство–СПБ, 2010. С. 583.

³² Лотман Ю. М. Тезисы к семиотическому изучению культур (в применении к славянским текстам) (совместно с Вяч. Вс. Ивановым, А. М. Пятигорским, В. Н. Топоровым, Б. А. Успенским) . *Семиосфера : Культура и взрыв. Внутри мыслящих миров. Статьи. Исследования. Заметки (1968-1992)*. Санкт-Петербург : Искусство–СПБ, 2010. С. 511.

of historical influences, allow the genres to be systematized³³. As is well known, the primary genre system is folklore, in which the first system-forming factor can be most clearly traced – the direct embodiment of archetypes as universal structures of the human psyche, which act as attractors in literary systems.

Consequently, without pretending to be exhaustive, I'll try to outline those system-forming dominants, which, despite steady dynamics, remain unchanged and “connect” genres among themselves. Such a consideration should begin with the problem of the unconscious influence. As mentioned above, Julia Kristeva proposed to consider the evolution of literary genres as an unconscious exteriorization of speech structures. However, according to leading representatives of psychological literary criticism, the most important is the unconscious exteriorization of mental structures – archetypes.

Archetypes are able to determine the choice and modification of genres and to subjectively influence the writer's wish, and globally – to determine the genre systems formation, since they are the expressions of the collective unconscious. Interestingly, certain genres are not only the result of the archetypes' presentation, and even their correlates (since they are the expressions of certain discourse thinking types)³⁴. If such an observation is characteristic for linguistic genres, where the archetype is realised as a concept, then it is quite appropriate in relation to literary genres. Genre structures generated by archetypes bear their traces and at the appropriate levels of the text materialize the unconscious: an archetype each time fills itself with content in a particular artistic work. The materialization of archetypes occurs through the language of artistic imagery, especially through symbols, which semiotically explains and clarifies them.

Polemizing with some psychoanalytic methods of reading symbolism, M. Mamardashvili and A. Piatigorsky emphasize the problem of abstract interpretation of a symbol as a thing whose meaning is always present elsewhere and suggest that the symbol interpretation should be regarded as an act clarifying the structures of consciousness. In the interpretation the symbol becomes not only the sign of something, but also by the signified and signifying at the same time.

³³ Смирнов И. П. Олитературное время. (Гипо)теория литературных жанров. Санкт-Петербург : РХГА, 2008. С. 61.

³⁴ Алефиренко Н. Ф. Концепт и значение в жанровой организации речи: когнитивно-семасиологические корреляции. *Жанры речи : сборник научных статей*. Саратов : Колледж, 2005. Вып. 4. Жанр и концепт. С. 50.

The semiotic system is a certain projection of consciousness, the symbology of which lies between consciousness and the unconscious. This view was inspired by the wish to overcome certain fallacies of understanding semiotic systems as ideal sign levels (without corresponding projection in consciousness), or as an “active extension” of the human psyche features³⁵. Systems, regardless of their origin (biological or informational), can perform the same functions of consciousness. Consequently, genre systems are carriers of sign information of the specifics of human consciousness.

The rejection of the term “archetype” in the theory of M. Mamardashvili and A. Pyatigorsky does not involve refusing to operate concepts that would denote the primary mental structures produced symbols. The difference lies in the fact that the scientists put these structures into the consciousness sphere, emphasizing their spontaneity. These initial symbols correlate with the original myths, and at the level of inclusion in the mythological systems – as secondary symbols – undergo an ideological interpretation³⁶. Thus, it is not about refusal from the unconscious sphere, but it is emphasized that unconscious structures acquire their sense when they’ve passed into the consciousness sphere. In this interpretation, there is no difference between understanding the archetype nature in analytic psychology of C. G. Jung and the theory of M. Mamardashvili and A. Pyatigorsky. Despite the lack of a standardized definition of archetypes, one can note the clear correlation between the unconscious and the conscious in the embodiment process of unconscious mental structures: “The archetype is essentially an unconscious content that is altered by becoming conscious and by being perceived, and it takes its colour from the individual consciousness in which it happens to appear” (translated by R.F.C. Hull)³⁷. So the sign is realized after the transition of an archetype from the unconscious, or rather, the collective unconscious, into the consciousness of a person, which, despite its own universality, is individualized. Thus, two components of the archetype can be distinguished in pieces of fiction: biopsychic (as a psychological component of the collective unconscious) and noospheric (the

³⁵ Мамардашвили М. К., Пятигорский А. М. Символ и сознание. Метафизические рассуждения о сознании, символикe и языке. Москва : Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1997. С. 86–87.

³⁶ Мамардашвили М. К., Пятигорский А. М. Символ и сознание. Метафизические рассуждения о сознании, символикe и языке. Москва : Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1997. С. 133.

³⁷ Юнг К. Г. Про архетипи колективного несвідомого. *Архетипи і колективне несвідоме*. Перекл. з нім. К. Котюк ; наук. ред. укр. вид. О. Фешовець. Львів : Астролябія, 2013. С. 14–15.

presentation of archetype in art, further influence of the archetype on culture and its development)³⁸.

The extra-genre systems that cause fluctuations can be considered another system-forming factor. In his latest book, “Culture and Explosion”, to which the works of I. Prigogine, mentioned above, had the greatest influence, Yu. Lotman proposed and substantiated the holistic theory of explosive processes in culture. The translation of the basic postulates of this theory into the new rethinking of genre processes is now used by Ukrainian literary critics, in particular in the studies of T. Sverbilova³⁹ and O. Bandrovskaya⁴⁰.

Yu. Lotman considered the source of genre dynamics to be the results of crossing different, often opposite, structural organizations – texts that carry out free movement in the semiosphere space, colliding and pushing, surviving and disintegrating into stable elements capable under certain conditions to a new rebirth. The choice of one of the possible ways of developing a genre system is random and does not depend on the laws of causality and probability – these laws “come into force” only at the time of random selection of one of the potential paths. According to Yu. Lotman, at the moment of the cultural explosion the complexity of the genre system is sharply increasing – new genres and genre types arise, marginalized genres are on the foreground, and the leading genres are marginalized or disappearing. In this case, “any element from another system may be a dominant one occurring as the explosion result and determines the future movement, accidentally involved in the explosion in interweaving the possibilities of this future movement”⁴¹.

Subsequently, the dominant element – the genre dominant in the case analysed here – already creates a predictable series of events. After the explosion moment, the second stage occurs – the comprehension of the processes that took place as “quite natural” and “historically determined”, that is, there is a linear reconstruction of the past.

³⁸ Большакова А. Ю. Архетип и его именование в художественной словесности. *Polilog. Studia Neofilologiczne*. 2012. № 2. S. 16.

³⁹ Свербілова Т. Такі близькі, такі далекі... (жанрові моделі української та російської драми від модерну до соцреалізму в аспекті порівняльної поетики) : монографія. Черкаси : Маклаут, 2011. 559 с.

⁴⁰ Бандровська О. Модернізм між минулим і майбутнім: антропологічний дискурс англійського роману : монографія. Львів : ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 2014. 444 с

⁴¹ Лотман Ю. М. Культура и взрыв. *Семиосфера : Культура и взрыв. Внутри мыслящих миров. Статьи. Исследования. Заметки (1968-1992)*. Санкт-Петербург : Искусство-СПБ, 2010. С. 22–23.

The invasion of external texts (the word “text” is used here in the widest sense, not only philological one) into the space of a literary work provokes a cultural explosion, which Yu. Lotman describes as a bundle of unpredictability⁴². For example, the genre of the historical novel of the English literature is perceived with a well-established set of attributes. The emergence of this genre in the Romanticism literature and its spread in European literatures gave rise to various variants and, consequently, a distant from the reference novel by Sir W. Scott (the differences can be traced even in the works of his imitators and plagiarists).

Yu. Lotman considers the individual’s self-consciousness of the writer as one of the main factors influencing the possibility of an explosion. The author forms new signs of meaning, imposing some semantic spaces on others in moments of the highest upsurges of creative inspiration⁴³. The explanation of the emergence of creative inspiration is impossible without taking into account the actualization of certain archetypes in the writer’s unconscious mentioned above.

CONCLUSIONS

The theory of cultural explosion is extremely important for conducting comparisons of national literatures’ genre systems. The entrance of elements from another system into genre systems provokes the emergence of different ways of development looks like a linear process. The development of genre systems as a linear process is read by literary critics post factum. Such interpretation often gives rise to an understanding of the dynamics of the genre system as a metaphor for human life – at a certain period the genre begins to lose its ability to meet the demands of the author, literary life and society.

The different reaction of the genre systems of national literatures to elements introduced from exterior systems refutes cyclicity as a decisive sign of the development of literary systems. Comparison of the results (not the alternative and probable ways of cultural development, as suggested by Yu. Lotman, because in this case comparative literature risks turning into alternate history) of changes and transformations of

⁴² Лотман Ю. М. Культура и взрыв. *Семиосфера : Культура и взрыв. Внутри мыслящих миров. Статьи. Исследования. Заметки (1968-1992)*. Санкт-Петербург : Искусство–СПБ, 2010. С. 118.

⁴³ Лотман Ю. М. Культура и взрыв. *Семиосфера : Культура и взрыв. Внутри мыслящих миров. Статьи. Исследования. Заметки (1968-1992)*. Санкт-Петербург : Искусство–СПБ, 2010. С. 26–27.

genre systems through cultural explosions shows both general and exceptional identities.

Consequently, the subject of the nature, origin and development of genre systems in fiction is of paramount importance for modern genology. However, the above analysed systematic factors – the archetypal basis of the genre system, non-genre elements and the inclusion in the literary genre systems of various fields – are crucial for understanding the specifics of genre systems.

SUMMARY

In the research the author analyses the genre system as a set of genres within a separate literature at a certain historical and cultural stage which is in complex interconnections with each other and external social and artistic systems. It is proved that the accelerated development of literatures can be a definite “leap” – the “cultural explosion”, according to Yu. Lotman. The “explosive” development of Ukrainian prose is considered as the first step towards the establishment of its dissipative genre system. The appropriate self-organization and further evolution of the genre system provide the following major channels for the information exchange with other systems: the transplantation of “foreign” genres on the national “soil”, the archetypal basis (interrelation with the unconscious sphere), as well as spontaneous activity and contacts (open communication) with non-literary systems. The order parameters that determine the connections hierarchy in genre systems of literature are language, national character, culture, history, tradition, and imperial politics.

REFERENCES

1. Prigogine I., Stengers I. Order out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature. Bantam Books, 1984. 349 p.
2. Алефиренко Н. Ф. Концепт и значение в жанровой организации речи: когнитивно-семасиологические корреляции. *Жанры речи : сборник научных статей*. Саратов : Колледж, 2005. Вып. 4. Жанр и концепт. С. 50–64.
3. Арнольд В. И. Теория катастроф. 3-е изд., доп. Москва : Наука, 1990. 128 с.
4. Бандровська О. Модернізм між минулим і майбутнім: антропологічний дискурс англійського роману: монографія. Львів : ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 2014. 444 с.

5. Богданов А. А. Тектология: (Всеобщая организационная наука). В 2-х книгах. Редкол. : Л. И. Абалкин (отв. ред.) и др. Москва : Экономика, 1989. Кн. 1. 1989. 304 с.
6. Большакова А. Ю. Архетип и его именование в художественной словесности. *Polilog. Studia Neofilologiczne*. 2012. № 2. S. 13–25.
7. Буданов В. Г. Синергетическая методология в постнеклассической науке и образовании *Синергетическая парадигма: синергетика образования : коллективная монография*. Отв. ред. В. Г. Буданов. Москва : Прогресс-Традиция, 2006. С. 174–211.
8. Василькова В. В. Порядок и хаос в развитии социальных систем: (Синергетика и теория социальной самоорганизации). Санкт-Петербург : Лань, 1999. 480 с.
9. Гачев Г. Д. Гуманитарный комментарий к физике и химии. Диалог между науками о природе и о человеке. Москва : Логос, 2003. 512 с.
10. Гачев Г. Д. Неминуемое: Ускоренное развитие литературы. Москва : Худож. лит., 1989. 430 с.
11. Гачев Г. Д. Содержательность художественных форм. Эпос. Лирика. Театр. 2-е изд. ; послесловие В. А. Недзвецкого. Москва : Изд-во Моск. ун-та ; Изд-во «Флинта», 2008. 288 с.
12. Иванова Н. Свободная и своенравная или бессмысленная и умирающая? Заметки об определениях современной словесности. *Знамя*. 2012. № 7. URL: <http://magazines.russ.ru/znamia/2012/7/i14.html>.
13. Капица С. П., Курдюмов С. П., Малинецкий Г. Г. Синергетика и прогнозы будущего. Изд. 3-е. Москва : Едиториал УРСС, 2003. 288 с.
14. Князева Е. Н., Курдюмов С. П. Основания синергетики. Режимы с обострением, самоорганизация, темпомиры. Санкт-Петербург : Алетейя, 2002. 414 с.
15. Кристева Ю. Семиотика: Исследования по семанализу. Пер. с фр. Э. А. Орловой. Москва : Академический Проект, 2013. 285 с.
16. Лотман Ю. М. Внутри мыслящих миров. *Семиосфера : Культура и взрыв. Внутри мыслящих миров. Статьи. Исследования. Заметки (1968-1992)*. Санкт-Петербург : Искусство–СПБ, 2010. С. 150–390.

17. Лотман Ю. М. Культура и взрыв. *Семиосфера : Культура и взрыв. Внутри мыслящих миров. Статьи. Исследования. Заметки (1968-1992)*. Санкт-Петербург : Искусство–СПБ, 2010. С. 12–148.

18. Лотман Ю. М. Мозг – текст – культура – искусственный интеллект. *Семиосфера : Культура и взрыв. Внутри мыслящих миров. Статьи. Исследования. Заметки (1968-1992)*. Санкт-Петербург : Искусство–СПБ, 2010. С. 580–589.

19. Лотман Ю. М. Тезисы к семиотическому изучению культур (в применении к славянским текстам) (совместно с Вяч. Вс. Ивановым, А. М. Пятигорским, В. Н. Топоровым, Б. А. Успенским). *Семиосфера : Культура и взрыв. Внутри мыслящих миров. Статьи. Исследования. Заметки (1968-1992)*. Санкт-Петербург : Искусство–СПБ, 2010. С. 504–525.

20. Мамардашвили М. К., Пятигорский А. М. Символ и сознание. Метафизические рассуждения о сознании, символическом языке. Москва : Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1997. 224 с.

21. Пригожин И. Конец определённости. Время, хаос и новые законы природы. Ижевск : НИЦ «Регулярная и хаотическая динамика», 2000. 216 с.

22. Пропп В. Я. Исторические корни волшебной сказки. Научная редакция, текстологический комментарий И. В. Пешкова. Москва : Лабиринт, 2000. 336 с.

23. Пропп В. Я. Морфология волшебной сказки. Научная редакция, текстологический комментарий И. В. Пешкова. Москва : Лабиринт, 2001. 192 с.

24. Свербілова Т. Такі близькі, такі далекі... (жанрові моделі української та російської драми від модерну до соцреалізму в аспекті порівняльної поетики) : монографія. Черкаси : Маклаут, 2011. 559 с.

25. Зинченко В. Г. и др. Словарь по межкультурной коммуникации: понятия и персоналии. Москва : Флинта, 2010. 134 с.

26. Смирнов И. П. Олитературенное время. (Гипо)теория литературных жанров. Санкт-Петербург : РХГА, 2008. 264 с.

27. Хакен Г. Тайны природы. Синергетика: учение о взаимодействии. Москва ; Ижевск : Институт компьютерных исследований, 2003. 320 с.

28. Юнг К. Г. Про архетипи колективного несвідомого. *Архетипи і колективне несвідоме*. Перекл. з нім. К. Котюк; наук. ред. укр. вид. О. Фешовець. Львів : Астролябія, 2013. С. 11–63.

Information about the author:

Chyk D. Ch.

Doctor of Philological Sciences in Comparative Literature,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages
and their Teaching Methods,
Taras Shevchenko Regional Humanitarian
Pedagogical Academy of Kremenets
1, Litseynyi Lane, Kremenets, Ternopil Oblast, 47003, Ukraine