

NARRATOR IN THE ARTISTIC WORLD: THE COGNITIVE PROJECTIONS

Matsevko-Bekerska L. V.

INTRODUCTION

The metaphor of “dizziness”, once proposed by G. Genette to represent the deployment and specification of narratological discourse, currently, i.e., at the time after “narrative turn” (Martin Kreiswirth), is perhaps the most distinctive characteristic feature for understanding the essence of the newest studies in the field of exploring the specifics of narrative structures, their transformations and modifications, as well as the forms and methods of receptive and psychological adaptation in the mind of the reader as one of the important participants in the literary and artistic communication. Having been conceived in the bosom of structuralism, narratology has shown exceptional methodological flexibility, has appeared in numerous poetological and poetical studies, and convincingly proved the possibility, even the productivity and effectiveness, of the widest scientific and methodological synthesis. As I. Papusha shrewdly remarked, “narratology (along with semiotics, cognitivism, and communicative studies) became the first strict approach designed to streamline narrative ubiquity and to construct a model that would cover all narratives”¹. One of the segments that somehow supplement and detail the paradigm of “all narratives” is cognitive narratology, especially relevant in the “post-classical” period of the narratological discourse formation (“the post-classical narratology” of D. Herman, 1997, with an emphasis on cognitive aspects of narrative theory). Therefore, it is relevant to study the specificity of an important component of narratological toolkit the essence and functionality of the narrator in the prism of certain aspects of cognitive approach.

In modern literary criticism, the cognitive and narratological panorama tends to active expansion and detalization. As I. Papusha remarks, “in the last decades, human interest has gradually changed the

¹ Папуша І. Modus ponens. Нариси з наратології. Тернопіль. Крок. 2013. С. 17.

object of interest ... scientists start thinking about the essence of the narrative, the way of its existence or pragmatics”², which, in fact, led to the emergence and spread of the concept “narrative turn”. However, an equally important consequence of growth and detalization of the narratological paradigm is the direction of research studies into the depth of the artistic text, the attempt to identify and in some way streamline the cognitive sphere of the dialogue or the polylogue of consciousness: creation, perception, understanding, interpretation, etc. It is quite right to consider the question, which O. Sobchuk suggests to think over: “what is the subject of the study of cognitive narratology: textual structures or structures of human thinking?”³. Therefore, it is worth to approach to understanding of the essence of narrative center as a weighty factor rather than harmonization, rather than the differentiation of the two aforementioned subjects.

Igor Papusha insists on the ubiquity of narrative and refers to the position of Hayden White, who associates the dynamic diffusion of narrative with an opportunity to resolve “the problem of how to translate knowledge into the story, the problem of modeling the human experience”⁴. Characterizing the tendencies of “post-classical narratology”, David Herman emphasizes its cognitivist vector, and also defines three leading directions of the theoretical discourse growth methodological, thematic and contextual⁵. As a matter of fact, the search for “new technologies and methodologies”⁶ occurs in the field of narratological research in combination of two fundamentally important approaches – first, the story is the center of development of the ontological paradigm, and second, – it is possible to find answers to key questions of cognitive narratology. Analytical discourse is represented by the works of M. Fludernik, D. Herman, M. Jahn, A. Palmer, B. Vervaeck, L. Zunshine and other scientists whose attention is concentrated primarily on the specificity of the connection between narrative and consciousness, as well as on the transformation of understanding of the basic concepts in

² Папуша І. *Modus ponens*. Нариси з наратології. Тернопіль. Крок. 2013. С. 16.

³ Собчук О.В. Переосмислення понять наративності, персонажа і фокалізації в сучасній когнітивній наратології. *МАГІСТЕРІУМ*. Випуск 48. Літературознавчі студії. С. 12.

⁴ Папуша І. *Modus ponens*. Нариси з наратології. Тернопіль. Крок. 2013. С. 17.

⁵ *Ibidem*. С. 18.

⁶ *Ibidem*. С. 19.

narratology. For example, O. Sobchuk thoroughly analyzes the categories of narrativity, character, focalization⁷, R. Savchuk foregrounds two main problems: “finding out the cognitive status of narrative” and “recognition” of the mode of development and understanding of the narrative⁸, T. Grebeniuk thoroughly studies the cognitive aspects of the consciousness manifestation in the artistic narrative. For this purpose, the scholar refers to the theory of recognition of mental states and the concept of L. Zunshine⁹. At the same time, the problem of cognitive aspects of presentation is also discussed in linguistic research (I. Bekhta, O. Babeliuk). Thus, we can assume that cognitive discourse acquires a thematic detail, and specifies the leading directions of narratological research.

1. Literary and Artistic Work: the Space for Ontologization

Despite the active expansion of the field of narratives, the literary and artistic work retains its leading position as a basis of ontological communication, which grows into the space of communicating the intentions of creation – perception – interpretation – reinterpretations. Designing the parameters of communication to the plane of understanding the meanings of an artistic work is, in our opinion, one of the core aspects of cognitive narratology, making it possible to harmonize the “textual structures” and “structures of human thinking” (O. Sobchuk). The peculiarity of sense creation or the form of sense reproducibility in the artistic narrative, as well as its functional purpose, is considered in its canonical perception of the means of designing “the zone of psychological comfort” for the reader, in order that an individual self-recognition of personality could occur in an acceptable emotional and sensory context through mediation of the text. According to R. Barthes, “the text is directly related to pleasure, it is a pleasure without feeling

⁷Див. Собчук О.В. Переосмислення понять наративності, персонажа і фокалізації в сучасній когнітивній наратології. *МАГІСТЕРІУМ*. Випуск 48. Літературознавчі студії. С. 108–113.

⁸Савчук Р.І. Історія становлення наратології: від античної поетики до нових наративних практик студіювання художнього тексту. *Науковий вісник кафедри Юнеско КНЛУ. Серія Філологія. Педагогіка. Психологія*. 2015. Випуск 31. С. 111–119.

⁹Гребенюк Т.В. Когнітивні аспекти репрезентації свідомості в художній оповіді. *Наукові записки Бердянського державного педагогічного університету*. 2016. Випуск ІХ. С. 200–206.

alienated”¹⁰. Thus, the artistic narrative is the space where “everyone becomes an insider”. Adopting such an understanding of the receptive and interpretive discourse, the supporters of both purely narrative approach (insisting on the exhaustive analysis of the text, which focuses attention on the macro-communicative level of literary text and reveals complex organizational hierarchies with available pairs of a sender and a receiver of information) and discursive direction, whose subject of study is “the described and cited world”¹¹ have the opportunity to reach mutual understanding. However, the dialogical and communicative essence of the literary and artistic work itself has been removed beyond the discussion.

Cognitive approaches to understanding the essence of the narrative organization of artistic text make it possible to perceive the need to identify, and then to classify the characteristic features of the narrative in the structure of literary and aesthetic communication, which transforms into conventional communication. As observed by John Deely, “the first of narrative universals that we need to consider is actually a universal role of the narrative as the basis for the transmission of culture – the basis of [...] purely human semiosis by which biological heredity enters into the cumulative transfer of learning, which is possible only through the narrative”¹². The semiotic nature of the analysis of the artistic text felt the need to establish and grasp the contact between the world about which is narrated and the result of this message in the form of a complete artistic phenomenon with the participation of a certain mediator. It is the story that becomes the necessary means, which makes it possible to synthesize holistically all the previous cultural and aesthetic experience in the ontological matrix of meaningful units. The text fragments, in turn, intertwine in quirky combinations of meanings and thus create a new world: it is not only fictitious in relation to the description, but also quite real and recognizable at the sensual level – the world of associations, symbols and impressions. As a reflection of the need to articulate some knowledge about outer space, literature inevitably came up with the story

¹⁰ Барт Р. Від твору до тексту. *Слово. Знак. Дискурс : антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст.* / за ред. М. Зубрицької. Львів. Літопис. 2001. С. 495.

¹¹ Современное зарубежное литературоведение (страны Западной Европы и США) : концепции, школы, термины : энциклопедический справочник / ред.-сост. И.П. Ильин, Е.А. Цурганова. М. Intrada. 1996. С. 72.

¹² Ділі Дж. Основи семіотики. Львів. Арсенал, 2000. С. 39.

itself, since in such a way it became possible to adequately reflect the reality by giving the reader the right to search for himself in the content of the work. In fact, “from a certain point of view, everything is a relation of temporal and spatial neighborhood or similarity to everything else”¹³. In the broadest sense, a literary and artistic work is a manifestation of such a unique neighborhood. First of all, it establishes clear boundaries between what was or is (that is, the actual subject world) and what will appear in the mind of the reader (individually defined world of the fictional objectivity) as a result of the deployment and detalization of the cognitive chain. Textual material therefore has its own voice in order to articulate the original intellectual or ontological meaning and invite the reader to the aesthetic dia(poly)logue.

The synthesis of spatial planes of artistic material is important for understanding the aesthetic phenomena realized in the consciousness, and then the multiplicity of its simultaneous projections: on the concrete historical continuum of the author, the receptive readiness of an abstract recipient, determined by traditions and situational axiological priorities. Therefore, their own textual space must be different in the sense of creating flexibility and the ability to extrapolate the general nature of individual, and therefore, unpredictable perception. Spatial coordinates of the narrative manners also have signs of some autonomy of functioning in the structure of an artistic work. The question of temporal neighborhood is rather controversial, because attention is focused on the significant prolongation of the artistic phenomenon as a certain ontological process. It is associated with both the constant factors of literary development and the facts of ideological, socio-ideological, personal and axiological transformation, which is an integral attribute of any evolution. In this context, the narrative manner becomes important in the productive communication of previous experience, being the focus of preservation of traditions, and it also acts as an “aesthetic dictator”, accumulating certain values and rooting them into the mind of the reader. Thus, the story becomes a sign of aesthetic neighborhood in the broadest semantic interpretation of this concept.

¹³ Еко У. Надінтерпретація текстів. *Слово. Знак. Дискурс : антологія світової літературно-критичної думки XX ст.* / за ред. М. Зубрицької. Львів. Літопис. 2001. С. 551.

Due to the narrative, the text becomes an intermediary of communication, the deployment of the same narrative enables the movement of the work in the plane of specific coordinates: the depicted world moves from the imaginary arbitrariness of the author in the personal perception of the reader. Not always comfortable in the psychological sense, the process of acquiring new experience through the narration of something or about someone harmonizes the assimilation of the reader with an observation system of the new objective reality, initially alien to him, and, moreover, the formation of the character of another person. Gradual entry into the reality of the Other removes all obstacles to establishing a kind of silent dialogue, which acquires voluminous features in the process of psychological agreement of the reader with the text. Immersion in the artistic world synchronously with the unfolding of the story largely compensates for the lost “one’s own”, the place of which involuntarily enters the experience of another. Therefore, from the very beginning of the reading of the narrative text, there is a rather deep and invariably interesting dialogue between the two others – a work addressed to someone, and a reader willing to accept someone (the intention of the text). There is no doubt that “reading reflects the structure of expanding our experience so much that we must temporarily abandon the ideas and guidelines that shape our individuality before we embark on the experience of the world not yet known by us through the literary text. However, it is precisely in that process that something happens to us. That “something” needs to be considered more in detail, especially when the inclusion of the “unknown” in the sphere of our experience obscures a rather simple idea in the literary discussion, namely, the process of absorption of an unknown world is regarded as the identification of the reader with what he reads”¹⁴.

The cognitive aspects of the study of the specificity of artistic presentation suggest that the narrative specifics of literature are the basis for outlining the optimal communicative space that extends its own horizons, becoming the space of communication. Obviously, “the speaker, *der Erzähler*, is the Kantian epistemological assumption that we perceive the world not as it exists in itself, but as it passed through the

¹⁴Ізер В. Процес читання, феноменологічне наближення. *Слово. Знак. Дискурс : антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст.* / за ред. М. Зубрицької. Львів. Літопис. 2001. С. 363.

mind of a contemplative”¹⁵. W. Iser, referring to the arguments of G. Poulet about the uniqueness of appropriation of the experience of “someone else”, makes an interesting conclusion about the need for existence of some substance in agreeing positions: according to G. Poulet, the literary text acquires the completeness of existence only in the reader. It is clear that the texts contain ideas that are thought over by someone to the end, but at the time of reading, we become the subject who understands. Thus, the “subject-object” division disappears, which is a prerequisite for any cognition and any observations; elimination of such a division places the reading in a unique position, which implies the possibility of absorbing new experiences. The idea that in the process of reading we have to think through the thoughts of someone else, led Poulet to the following conclusion: “All that I think is a part of *my* mind world. And if I think of thoughts that obviously belong to another world of thought, then this world is a thought in me, although I did not exist in it [...] When I read, I mentally uttered the “I” and this “I”, which I say, is no longer me”¹⁶. Therefore, the approach to the literary work as a phenomenon of many voices is perhaps the most acceptable for the synthesis of achievements and the search for tangent narratology lines of research: structuralism, semiotics, phenomenology, receptive aesthetics, and cognitive psychology.

2. The Narrator: Functional Circle and Place in the System of Creation of Meanings

One of the key concepts for the narratological study of a literary work in the discourse of its cognitive projections is the understanding of the specificity, functionality and stylisticity of the narrator in the artistic space. First of all, “the art of the writer consists in how he outlines the boundaries of this space (the space of the figure), the visible body of the Literature”¹⁷. Therefore, before the text as the completion of verbalized experience, the author is modeling the figure of the one who will embody the worldview, invite the Other to the dialogue and rise above the literal

¹⁵Шмид В. Нарратология. М. Языки славянской культуры. 2003. С. 12.

¹⁶Ізер В. Процес читання, феноменологічне наближення. *Слово. Знак. Дискурс : антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст.* / за ред. М. Зубрицької. Львів, Літопис. 2001. С. 363.

¹⁷Женетт Ж. Фигуры. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах.* М. Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 1. С. 208

meaning of each word. R. Barthes polarized the objects of the study, adding rights to the interpreter and curtailing the creative intention of the author: “The author is considered the father and master of his work, so literary studies teach us to respect the autograph and openly certified intentions of the author ... In relation to the text, there is no record about his father [...] The Text does not require respect for any monolithic integrity, it can be disassociated”¹⁸. However, the complete and subjectively directed understanding of the work gives grounds for many doubts in the conclusion of such an interpretation, since it threatens to be so deeply rooted in the “metaphor grid” that more or less verbatim setting of meaning would be either impossible or alienated from the original plan. Probably, one of the functions of the narrator is to maintain equilibrium as a perception of the value of specific structural elements of the work, as well as a holistic understanding of its cognitive-aesthetic consistency.

The narrator is at the intersection of all subjectivized instances of the narrative literary work. The concept, widely used in the modern literary criticism, undergoes some synonymy, coming closer with the narrator, and then with the storyteller. By definition of W. Schmid, “the narrator is the addresser of the fictitious narrative communication”¹⁹. At that time, the narrator was called “a kind of literary subject, a person, imagined by the author, on its behalf the author narrates about events and people in the artwork”²⁰ or “a person acting in the work as a subject of the story, namely, as a hero, from a person whose epic or lyrico-epic kind of literature is being told and acting in the function of the imaginary author”²¹. His attribution is the absence of real relationships and contacts with the image of the world, but allows them to be imagined. Instead, the storyteller is defined as “a protagonist acting in the work both as a subject and as an object (directly or indirectly) of the narrative, that is, as a hero who is a participant or is directly related to the events that he tells”²². Moreover, he is sometimes called the narrator: “The narrator is a kind of

¹⁸ Барт Р. Від твору до тексту. *Слово. Знак. Дискурс : антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст.* / за ред. М. Зубрицької. Львів. Літопис. 2001. С. 494.

¹⁹ Шмид В. Нарратология. М. Языки славянской культуры. 2003. С. 63.

²⁰ Літературознавчий словник-довідник / авт.-уклад. Р.Т. Гром'як, Ю.І. Ковалів та ін. К. ВЦ “Академія”. 1997. С. 522.

²¹ Теорія літератури / за наук. ред. О. Галича. К. Либідь. 2001. С. 146.

²² Ibidem. С.149.

literary subject, a person who is designed by the author, on whose behalf he tells a story about events and people, through which the whole imaginary world of a literary work is formed; he is a literary figure, which, as a rule, is at the same time an author and a character”²³.

The problem of actualization of the place and the outline of the narrator’s functional circle in the narratological discourse arises not by chance – the contours of the new methodology are to a large extent conditioned by the possibility of multiple theoretical modifications of the modern research process. Attempts to synthesize narratological methodological tools with the parameters of cognitive psychology indicate that the need for another reading of well-known and little-known texts, as well as the flexibility of literary and artistic material on the application of diverse analytical procedures. Adhering to the classical conviction as to “what would be the need in the narrator, if the concept was revealed without language?”²⁴, the new terminological definition – “metanarrative” – was proposed by J. Lyotard to characterize the culture of the transitional period²⁵. According to the researcher, in the development of mankind, certain modes of knowledge of reality, models of their expression in history and narrative discourse have been formed. These models of narratives as ways in which a person narrates about himself and the surrounding reality, which have imposed on the world a human limiting framework, are called “metanarratives” in the postmodern philosophy. Consequently, “metanarratives” are “all those explanatory systems that organize society and serve as a means of self-justification”²⁶. In the search for ideological or psychological balance, a person tries to identify a newly seen or a newly perceived by a certain canon, therefore the initial analytical position can be considered a global system-forming model of awareness and assimilation of someone else's experience. A similar explanation for the need for updating philosophical foundations is found in the writings of G. Genette: “A modern person feels his time as an “anxiety”, his inner world as an intrusive care or nausea; given to the authorities of the “absurd” and tormented, he calms down, designing his mind on things by constructing plans and figures, thus drawing at least

²³ Літературознавчий словник-довідник / авт.-уклад. Р.Т. Гром’як, Ю.І. Ковалів та ін. К. ВЦ “Академія”. 1997. С. 602.

²⁴ Аристотель. Поетика. *Аристотель*. К. Мистецтво. 1967. С. 71.

²⁵ Лиотар Ж. Состояние постмодерна. М. Алетея. 1998. С. 5.

²⁶ Ibidem. С. 6.

some firmness and stability from the geometric space”²⁷. Therefore, the development of narratological concepts becomes fully justified in view of their ability to maximally assimilate the research into the subject of an artistic text.

The modern narratological discourse focuses on two key research objects, therefore, two directions of analytical study of a literary work are synchronously developing: the “narrative” and “communicative” ones. For the first one, the text is important as a statement of the sequential deployment of events, as a gradual reproduction of a certain story; the second one is set forth directly on the artistic text as a mediator for the communication between the author and the reader. G. Genette insists that the basis of any theoretical reasoning about the functioning of artistic text in the cultural space is the opposition of “objective narrative and subjective discourse”²⁸. In the studies of I. Papusha, this differentiation of narrative has the following format: “representations” and demonstrations of a certain number of its properties – “temporal and causal”²⁹. Over time, with radical changes in the contextual space of not only literature but also culture in general, there is a need to penetrate the hypothetically original sense of work from the point of view unexpected both for the author and for his first readers. In particular, according to G. Genette, “the structural method as such arises at a time when the code again reveals a newly open message – discovered as a result of the analysis of immanent structures, and not imposed from the outside by the force of ideological prejudices”³⁰. Therefore, the narrator as a subject, as a function and a method of the new reading of literary codes, seems to be quite appropriate in the field of terminological categories of the leading literary trends during the transitional period – the period of the 20th-21st centuries.

²⁷Женетт Ж. Пространство и язык. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах*. М. Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 1. С. 127.

²⁸Женетт Ж. Границы повествовательности. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах*. М. Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 1. С. 294.

²⁹Папуша І. Міжнародна наратологія: проблеми дефініції. *Теорія літератури, компаративістика, україністика : збірник наукових праць з нагоди сімдесятиріччя д. ф. н., проф. Р. Гром'яка / упор. М. Лановик та ін. Studia methodologica*. Вип. 19. Тернопіль. Підручники та посібники. 2007. С. 31.

³⁰Женетт Ж. Структурализм и литературная критика. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах*. М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 2. С. 164.

Already from the beginning of its methodological assertion, narratology was on the brink of structuralism, receptive aesthetics and hermeneutics. In spite of this, the proper “narrative” categories become particularly relevant for this field of studies: “communicative understanding of the nature of literature; the idea of an act of artistic communication as a process that occurs simultaneously at several narrative levels; predominant interest in the problem of discourse; the theoretical substantiation of numerous narrative instances that act as members of the communicative chain, which carries out the “transfer” of artistic information from the writer to the reader who are at different poles of the process of artistic communication”³¹. In the context of narrative research, some categories of receptive aesthetics, in particular, the concept of the textual strategy, are harmoniously fitted. Being outlined by H. Jauss as the dependence of the reader's perception not only on his subjective position, this concept acquires the ability to depend on the narrative instruction of the author and thus articulated as a concept of narrative analysis. Adding cognitive disposition to the post-classical narratology format complements and specifies the psychological aspects of cognition and interpretation of artistic phenomena.

The notion of the narrator is semantically interconnected. After all, the formalization of the narrative authority does not deduce the intention of creating beyond the bounds of the artistic world, it only organizes the communicative text field. Important is the ability of the constituent to become the center of understanding in the classical oppositional structure between language and speech, between the addressee and the recipient, and then between the sense and meaning of the text. Indeed, “literary” production “is a speech in the Saussurean – a series of individual, partly autonomous and unpredictable speech acts; “consumption” of the same literature by society is a language, that is, a certain whole, whose elements, regardless of their number and nature, tend to order in the framework of a connected system”³². The author's speech is carried out within the limits permitted by the historicity of the language in its original sense, as well as in the context of a set of secondary values that are

³¹Современное зарубежное литературоведение (страны Западной Европы и США) : концепции, школы, термины : энциклопедический справочник / ред.-сост. И.П. Ильин, Е.А. Цурганова. М. Intrada. 1996. С. 69.

³² Женетт Ж. Структурализм и литературная критика. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах.* М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 2. С. 174.

obscured for the reader from subsequent generations. Furthermore, the reader is primarily dependent on his own intellectual and axiological environment, so he designs the proposed text according to the selfish need to be self-recognizable. Thus, the differences are clearly articulated between what is described (the narrative) and what is perceived (discourse).

According to G. Genette, the basis of differentiation is the psychological categories of objective – subjective: “the objective narrative and the subjective discourse”, that is, “subjective” is the discourse in which the presence of “me” is explicitly or implicitly marked (or referred to it), but this “I” is not defined simply as the person who declares this speech. The present time, i.e., the main time of discursive mode of expression, is defined only as the moment at which the given speech is spoken, so that its use is marked by “the coincidence in time of the described event with the speech act that describes it”. And vice versa, the objectivity of the narrative is defined as the complete lack of reference to the narrator”³³. It is the narrator who must establish or determine the level of reader’s autonomy and responsibility – he either gives a guideline for the full assimilation of the receptive field with the intentional efforts of the author, or creates the impression of the reader's selfhood and allows the use of a completely objectified world. At the same time, the narrator outlines the boundaries of fiction in the artistic space, since the reader is invited to identify the dominant features of what was or what could have been depicted in the text. Places of conjecture of a descriptive picture and summing of existing or imagined values of text fragments are established in the expressive predominance of narrative knowledge.

Trying to bring the author's language (the language of the text) and the reader's speech (the language of the work) together as closely as possible, G. Genette notes that “in the discourse, there is almost always a certain part of narrativity; whereas in the narrative, there is a certain part of discursiveness”³⁴. Probably this happens precisely because of the communicative strategy of the entire complex of formal and informative factors of the literary work as a holistic aesthetic and cognitive

³³Женетт Ж. Границы повествовательности. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах*. М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 1. С. 295.

³⁴ Ibidem. С. 297.

phenomenon: just as the author hopes to articulate the perception of his experience to someone else and therefore behaves like a real participant in the dialogue he modeled, the reader identifies himself with the Ideal Reader (U. Eco), and considers his version of the meaning of the work quite similar to the author's idea. Therefore, the narrative and discourse synchronously coincide in the direct deployment of the text – specifications of the event and to some extent diverge at the level of individualization of meaning. The process of summing the meanings of a particular text occurs not only under the influence of the subjective reader's expectation and its implementation, but also as a completely objective development of eventivity from one point of the plot to the next one (or ones). According to G. Genette, “it is not difficult to define a narrative as an image of one or more successive events, real or fictional, through the mediation of language, including the written language”³⁵.

In order to establish the cognitive foundations of perceiving the narrative, it should be taken into account that within the limits of some event that forms the basis of a work, the author must be aware that at the stage of reception the event designed by him will revive, overcoming his original meaning: “The main provision should be taken: the arbitrariness of the narrative [...] that dizzying freedom, which gives the narrative, firstly, the possibility whatever orientation to choose at any step, [...] i.e., the arbitrariness of the direction (or streamline – *L. M-B.*); and secondly, the freedom to stay in place and swell at the expense of adding various circumstances, messages, signs, [...] i.e., the arbitrariness of distribution. Hence, the illusion of the complete imitation of the reality of determinism would be opposed to another one – possible-at-every-moment, which seems to be more true”³⁶. Thus, the division of the object of the narrative research into its cognitive coordinates may continue in relation to the plane of the implementation of the text – the perception of the event itself as a fact and representation of the illusory contact of the reader's imagination with the depicted deployment of the event as realized in the fiction world. Actually, the reader's strategy in this case is more suitable for modifications, because, unlike the author, the reader's fixing of the meanings read at some point in the text is situational, unpredictable,

³⁵ Женетт Ж. Границы повествовательности. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах.* М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 1. С. 284.

³⁶ Женетт Ж. Правдоподобие и мотивация. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах.* М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 1. С. 317.

depending on the psychological state of the recipient. The freedom of the author's perspective is limited by the fact of written fixation of both the event and its tendentious coloring, with the discourse of author's focalization gradually shifted in favor of an individualized perception. Obviously, therefore, by distinguishing between “three types of narrative: putative, motivated, and arbitrary”, G. Genette observes that “the unequivocal difference is the difference between a motivated and unmotivated narrative. This distinction obviously leads us to the already recognized opposition to the narrative and discourse”³⁷. That is, there is an expressive attempt to realize the artistic plane in the system of the conceptual apparatus of receptive aesthetics, as well as narratology and cognitive psychology.

In order to outline the cognitive horizon of the study of artistic narrative, one should take into account the fact that the nature of the literary phenomenon is complex and multilevel, and an attempt of unambiguous interpretation of the essence of the narrative source will inevitably result in failure. The narrative plane of research grows to a system of values analogously to the expansion of the communicative space of the text itself, which will gradually communicate with the reader. If a literary work is recognized as a “secondary modeling system”, the outline of the narrative contours of the analytical process resembles a “tertiary modeling system” or “the system of the third level of values” (by analogy with the classification of the narrator in the concept by W. Schmid), but its semantics is much wider and more arbitrary, since it is determined predominantly by non-textual factors. The context of creation is only partially overlapping in semantic positions with the context of perception, because in the first prominent place belongs to the complex representations of the author about the world, which is projected onto the expected reader's response, and for the second – the main thing is the life experience of the recipient itself, and the more we deviate from the historical creation, the more noticeably the reception context darkens the original meaning of the work. Therefore, the function of the narrator is determined also by the need to restrain the arbitrariness of reading, to correct the instructions and expectations from aesthetic communication,

³⁷ Женетт Ж. Правдоподобие и мотивация. *Фигуры* : в 2-х томах. М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 1. С. 322.

as articulated by the reader, and to ascertain the author's context as fully as possible.

The concept of context, which is key for receptive aesthetics (proposed by W. Iser), becomes important in the creation of cognitive discourse of narratological paradigm in the text analysis. The totality of external factors concerning the literary and figurative world attracts G. Genette's attention and leads to reflection on the method of aesthetic communication, namely: “under what conditions a certain text, oral or written, can be perceived as a literary work», or, more broadly, as a (verbal) object that is endowed with an aesthetic function”³⁸. The synthesis of narratology and cognitive science is due to the fact that phenomenological attribution of the creation of being by the perceived consciousness is incorporated into the field of studying the specifics of the narrative nature of literature. After all, there is nothing predetermined for it, and the depiction of the world of a literary work is only a prerequisite for modeling one's own conception of a certain fictional world that acquires real contours precisely in the consciousness and is identified as a primary aspect in the system of meanings. Therefore, the “constitutional mode of literariness” can appeal to aspects of narrative's fictitiousness, and “conditional mode of literariness” – can become the object of the communicative narrative.

Cognitive narratology can join the solution of the complex problem as to the clear delineation of the limits of the author's intention and freedom of interpretation, which is partially represented by verbal formulation of the text, in particular, the articulation of the author's point of view on an event or its preconditions, and has every reason not to be assimilated into the personal space of the reader. Suggestion should have attributes for recognition and appropriation of someone else's imaginary world, that is, “speech acts of characters of both dramatic and narrative fiction are authentic speech acts that possess all of the locutionary characteristics, the illocutionary force and “the point of application”, and all deliberate and unintentional perlocutionary effects. The problem consists in the constitutional speech acts of the very context, in other words, the narrative discourse itself – the author's discourse”³⁹. The

³⁸ Женетт Ж. Правдоподобие и мотивация. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах.* М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 1. С. 317.

³⁹ Женетт Ж. Вымысел и слог. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах.* М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 2. С. 369.

process of formatting the narrative discourse must distinguish the narrative assignment of the text from its receptive plane. The existence of narrative or narrative instance in one way or another embodies many contextual layouts. For the better in the qualitative sense and deeper, in the opinion of the author, communication he introduces a significant range of ideological, ethical, abstract and personal hints. The function of the narrator is to assimilate a set of prompts of “the author's discourse” into that of the reader. Therefore, the literary text offers a modification of the narrative strategy, defined by the original idea of creation. Even with the separation of “the only type of literary discourse that has a specific illocutionary status, it is “extra-personal” narrative invention”⁴⁰. The conditionality of such an analytical operation should be recognized, since extra-personality can also be conscious or intentional, in other words – the author's narrative strategy, which defines a strategy of perception and interpretation.

For mutual transformation of “textual structures” and “structures of human thinking” (O. Sobchuk) we should consider the concept of narratological study of the text, which was presented in his writings by W. Schmid. The author specifies the research palette in two main directions: “1) “perspective” (the communicative structure of the narrative, narrative instances, the point of view, the ratio of the text of the narrator and the text of the character), and 2) plot (narrative transformations, the role of timeless connections in the narrative text)”⁴¹. Such a synthetic position is extremely productive in the context of the studying the specificity of the transposition of the text into the mind of the reader, since it makes it possible to integrate the key concepts of the content and formal organization of the literary and artistic work. According to W. Schmid, “narrativity”⁴² is characterized by two distinct concepts in the literary criticism. The first of these was formed in the classical theory of the narrative, primarily in the theory of German origin, which then was called not narratology, but *Erzählforschung* or *Erzähltheorie* (the narrative theory). In this tradition, literary works were attributes to the narrative or story-telling category according to the communicative structure. The literary work was associated with the

⁴⁰ Женетт Ж. Вымысел и слог. *Фигуры* : в 2-х томах. М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 2. С. 385.

⁴¹ Шмид В. Нарратология. М. Языки славянской культуры. 2003. С. 9.

⁴² Ibidem.

presence in the text of the voice of the mediated instance, called the “narrator” or the “storyteller”. In the classical theory of narrative, the main feature of a narrative work is the presence of such an intermediary between the author and the narrative world. The essence of the narrative was reduced to the classical theory of refracting the narrative reality through the prism of the author's perception.

The second notion of narrativity [which is the basis of the work of W. Schmid – *L. M.-B.*] was formed in the structuralist narratology. In accordance with this concept, decisive in the story is not a sign of the structure of communication, but a sign of the structure of the narrator as such, which greatly converges the proposed approach with the possibility of its cognitive projections. The term “narrative” refers not to the presence of an indirect instance of the statement, but to a particular structure of the presentation material. Texts, defined as narrative in the structuralist sense, are present a certain *story*, possessing a temporal structure at a level of the depicted world. An event is some change in the initial situation: either *external* situation in the narrative world (*natural, actional and interactional events*), or internal situation of a particular character (*mental events*) [...], in the structuralist sense, narrative works present the story in which the event is displayed”⁴³. Thus, we can assume that the position of W. Schmid as a follower of structuralist methodology is the continuation or reproduction of a new semantic level of classical understanding of the narrative nature of the text. In the future, the structure of narrative will lead to identification of the specifics of its cognition and perception, and therefore – can be designed at the level of structures of human thinking.

The essence of mediated instance of the statement does not cause any doubts or objections, only the fundamental principles of typology will not relate to the definition of the author's original intention and the subsequent determination of the semantic strategy of the work, but to the outline of the contours of events and differentiation of narrative behavior in the direct fiction world. Therefore, it is important to differentiate objects that should be perceived as actual in a conscious fictional world: “Actual” in a dramatic sense is an event that is occurring now [...] “Actual” in the sense of epic is, first of all, not an event which is narrated,

⁴³ Шмид В. Нарратология. М. Языки славянской культуры. 2003. С. 11–13.

but the narrative itself”⁴⁴. Thus, according to the structuralist approach, the specificity of the event is determined by the dependence on the “minimum condition”, which is: “the existence of a change in some initial situation, regardless of whether the given text indicates the causal links of this change with its other thematic elements or not (in contrast to the position of B. Tomashevskyi, who attributed the plot to “not only a temporal, but also a causal property)”⁴⁵. At the same time, an event is “actual” in the receptive and psychological plane when the reader learns about something “here and now”, regardless of repetition of this procedure.

Other, not less important, according to W. Schmid, conditions of the event are “factuality or reality” and “resulting quality”⁴⁶ of changes of some initial state. Even as part of the imaginary reader (and created as the author), the described event should be perceived as a fulfilled fact of the characters’ life or the formation of their spiritual experience, and simultaneously with exhaustion of the textual array, the semantic decoupling should be articulated, that is, an understanding of that “something happened” in the mind of the reader. And then we can add W.Schmid's “criteria of maximum eventivity” to the paradigm of adequate perception of the artistic world⁴⁷:

- “relevance” – an event must be significant in its meaning space;
- “unpredictability” – the level of destruction of the horizon of the reader's expectations increases the semantic loading of even the usual situation;
- “consecutiveness” – change in attitude or perception of the character, caused by the event;
- “irreversibility” – is manifested in the maximum climax of the change in the initial state, when it becomes clear to the reader that the return to it is no longer possible;
- “repeatability” – the semantic weight of the event becomes valuable for its one-time reproduction, multiple repetitions in the image remove the narrative tension, and the text is modified from the narrative form into the descriptive one.

⁴⁴ Шмид В. Нарратология. М. Языки славянской культуры. 2003. С. 25.

⁴⁵ Ibidem. С. 13.

⁴⁶ Ibidem. С. 15.

⁴⁷ Ibidem. С. 16-18.

Thus, on the one hand, “narration, by catching signals from all previous levels and responding to them, appears as a complexly organized, internally contradictory set of the diversity of language-forming entities”, and on the other, “the atomic wealth of the level of narration is unattainable for its sufficient detalization”⁴⁸. Therefore, among the specified features of the event and the criteria for its maximum realization, others will be added unexpectedly due to the peculiarities of the direct artistic world. Among them, an important place should belong to the detected peculiarities of the reader's self-identification, which, by assigning the experience of the Other, and being in the world of the Other, masters all the event attributes in aggregate.

CONCLUSIONS

For cognitive narratology, the spiritual world of the author is important, which is largely modelled for textual design. Contextual factors are added to it, and it is projected in advance on the expected reactions of the reader (readers) and the literary process in general. Therefore, the spirituality of the narrator has all the signs of a “secondary modeling system”: it is created according to certain canons and rules; it begins to function as a self-sufficient organism with its own levers of persuasion of the recipient. For the most part, the reader identifies the psychological nature of the author, precisely because of the prism permitted by the narrator; his interpretation of the literary work unfolds from his point of view. By definition of M. Lehkyi, “the narrator is a linguistic and stylistic epicenter of presentation. The reader perceives “here” and “now” of the narrator as the starting point of his chronotopic orientation. Narrator is a fictitious figure, contrived by the author, derived from his consciousness, and he is not devoid of some autonomy”⁴⁹. To understand the specifics of psychology of reading and understanding, one must take into account that the essence of the narrator synthesizes all the inherent features of literature as a spiritual and intellectual phenomenon: the rooting of a certain personal experience into the matrix of the text with subsequent openness to the infinite reception and interpretation, staying in a created fiction world with unique time and spatial

⁴⁸ Кодак М. Поетика як система. Літературно-критичний нарис. К. Дніпро. 1988. 157 с. С. 131.

⁴⁹ Легкий М. Форми художнього викладу в малій прозі І. Франка : дис. на здобуття наукового ступеня канд. філол. наук : 10.01.01. Львів. 1997. С. 22.

characteristics, objective reproduction of events in various forms, coexistence of several speech planes, which allow polyphony of the artistic text, etc.

Autonomy of the narrator is a constant of a narrative work, since it gives the opportunity to polarize the author and characters, the author and the reader, the fictional world of the depicted reality is modified in the imaginary real world, known by the reader. That is, being the subject of the statement, “the narrator forms this statement, and with him – the artistic world of the work”⁵⁰. Therefore, for the cognitive field of research, the narratological principles remain of paramount importance: identification of the narrator in the literary work, which include “the point of view, adopted in the narration, the distance to characters and events, the epistemological perspective and principles of appreciation, knowledge of the world and the means of limiting and motivating this knowledge”⁵¹. The psychological aspects of the knowledge of the artistic narrative are based on the understanding of the nature of the narrator as a complex organization with many ways of his appearance as an intermediary between:

a) the real world to which the biographical author belongs and the fiction world of the artistic work;

b) the depicted symbolically significant world of the literary work and cognitive competence of the reader;

c) intellectual, ideological, aesthetic, moral experience of the author and receptive readiness of the reader for a specific, one-way dialogue;

d) speech constructions, natural for the real author, tendentially modelled speech of characters and the reader's response to another cultural historical reality on the verbalization of the spiritual essence of a remote epoch.

Thus, the problem of the narrator in the literary discourse synthesizes a variety of approaches and principles of analysis. The narrative paradigm of an artistic text, being designed for the cognitive coordinates of its study, has the ability to deepen the knowledge of the text, to express understanding of its meaning(s), to deepen the contextual horizons of its interpretation.

⁵⁰ Легкий М. Форми художнього викладу в малій прозі І. Франка : дис. на здобуття наукового ступеня канд. філол. наук : 10.01.01. Львів. 1997. С. 22.

⁵¹ Głowiński M., Kotsiewiczowa T., Okopień-Sławińska A., Sławiński J. Słownik terminów literackich. Wrocław ; Warszawa ; Kraków ; Gdańsk. 1976.

SUMMARY

The article presents the study of two important components of narratological discourse – narrativity and narrator in the structure of artistic presentation, based on the interesting metaphor (“dizziness”) once proposed by G. Genette,. The deployment and detalization of narratological discourse at the time after the “narrative turn” (M. Kreiswirth) makes it possible to focus on the problems of modern studies in the field of exploring the specifics in presentation structures, their transformations and modifications, as well as the forms and methods of receptive and psychological adaptation in the mind of the reader as one of important participants in the literary and artistic communication. Having been conceived in the bosom of structuralism, narratology has proven its productive methodological flexibility, and has been revealed in numerous poetological and poetical studies, having convincingly proved the possibility and effectiveness of the widest scientific and methodological synthesis. The combination of forms and methods of designing the parameters of aesthetic communication to the plane of understanding the meanings of an artistic work is one of the core aspects of cognitive narratology, making it possible to harmonize the “textual structures” and “structures of human thinking” (O. Sobchuk). The peculiarity of sense creation or the form of creation reproducibility in the artistic narrative, as well as its functional purpose, is considered in its canonical perception as the means of creation of “the zone of psychological comfort” for the reader, in order that an individual self-recognition of personality could occur in an acceptable emotional and sensory context through mediation of the text. The proposed interpretation of the problem of artistic narrative in the parameters of creation of meaning, as well as in the complex with the question of the nature and appointment of a narrator makes it possible to formulate the basic principles for modelling the cognitive panorama of narratological discourse.

REFERENCES

1. Głowiński M., Kotsiewiczowa T., Okopień-Sławińska A., Sławiński J. Słownik terminów literackich. Wrocław ; Warszawa ; Kraków ; Gdańsk. 1976.
2. Аристотель. Поэтика. *Аристотель*. К. Мистецтво. 1967. 136 с.

3. Барт Р. Від твору до тексту. *Слово. Знак. Дискурс : антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст.* / за ред. М. Зубрицької. Львів. Літопис. 2001. С. 491–496.
4. Гребенюк Т.В. Когнітивні аспекти репрезентації свідомості в художній оповіді. *Наукові записки Бердянського державного педагогічного університету*. 2016. Випуск ІХ. С. 200–206.
5. Ділі Дж. Основи семіотики. Львів. Арсенал, 2000. 231 с.
6. Еко У. Надінтерпретація текстів. *Слово. Знак. Дискурс : антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст.* / за ред. М. Зубрицької. Львів. Літопис. 2001. С. 549–563.
7. Женетт Ж. Вымысел и слог. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах*. М. Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 2. С. 342–452.
8. Женетт Ж. Границы повествовательности. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах*. М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 1. С. 283–299.
9. Женетт Ж. Правдоподобие и мотивация. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах*. М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 1. С. 299–322.
10. Женетт Ж. Пространство и язык. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах*. М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 1. С. 126–132.
11. Женетт Ж. Структурализм и литературная критика. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах*. М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 2. С. 159–179.
12. Женетт Ж. Фигуры. *Фигуры : в 2-х томах*. М., Изд-во Сабашниковых. 1998. Т. 1. С. 205–217.
13. Ізер В. Процес читання, феноменологічне наближення. *Слово. Знак. Дискурс : антологія світової літературно-критичної думки ХХ ст.* / за ред. М. Зубрицької. Львів. Літопис. 2001. С. 349–368.
14. Кодак М. Поетика як система. Літературно-критичний нарис. К. Дніпро. 1988. 157 с.
15. Легкий М. Форми художнього викладу в малій прозі І. Франка : дис. на здобуття наукового ступеня канд. філол. наук : 10.01.01. Львів. 1997. 182 с.
16. Лиотар Ж. Состояние постмодерна. М. Алетея. 1998.
17. Літературознавчий словник-довідник / авт.-уклад. Р.Т. Гром'як, Ю.І. Ковалів та ін. К. ВЦ "Академія". 1997. 752 с.
18. Папуша І. Modus ropens. Нариси з наратології. Тернопіль. Крок. 2013. 259 с.
19. Папуша І. Міжнародна наратологія: проблеми дефініції. *Теорія літератури, компаративістика, україністика : збірник наукових праць з нагоди сімдесятиріччя д. ф. н., проф. Р. Гром'яка /*

упор. М. Лановик та ін. // *Studia methodologica*. Вип. 19. Тернопіль. Підручники та посібники. 2007. С. 31–37.

20. Савчук Р.І. Історія становлення наратології: від античної поетики до нових наративних практик студіювання художнього тексту. *Науковий вісник кафедри Юнеско КНЛУ. Серія Філологія. Педагогіка. Психологія*. 2015. Випуск 31. С. 111–119.

21. Собчук О.В. Переосмислення понять наративності, персонажа і фокалізації в сучасній когнітивній наратології. *МАГІСТЕРІУМ*. Випуск 48. Літературознавчі студії. С. 108–113.

22. Современное зарубежное литературоведение (страны Западной Европы и США) : концепции, школы, термины : энциклопедический справочник / ред.-сост. И.П. Ильин, Е.А. Цурганова. М. Intrad. 1996. 319 с.

23. Теорія літератури / за наук. ред. О. Галича. К. Либідь. 2001. 488 с.

24. Шмид В. Нарратология. М. Языки славянской культуры. 2003. 312 с.

Information about the author:

Matsevko-Bekerska L. V.

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Head of World Literature Department,
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv
1, Universytetska str., Lviv, 79000, Ukraine