

*Lidiia Matsevko-Bekerska*

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv*

### **COGNITIVE AND NARRATIVE ASPECTS OF PERCEIVING A LITERARY WORK**

The problem of the reader occupies the leading position in the modern literary criticism discourse and becomes a focus of increasingly active interest, undergoing dynamic transformation in terms of research methodology and projections on the framework of a literary text. In terms of cognitive aspects of artistic and aesthetic phenomenon, the sequence of presentation of all conceptual elements occurs as a self-sufficient communicative process. At the same time, its integrity and authenticity is ensured, above all, by the reader, who is ready for an appropriate aesthetic dialogue. Hence, the problem of the reader / reading is particularly relevant in the context of developing a methodology, in particular, for the cognitive and narratological study of both individual literary works and the author's style or certain parameters of poetics.

The unfolding of a plot or significant problematics has a temporal and spatial paradigm characteristic of the literary world. The kaleidoscopic change of depicted images and the transition from one temporal projection to the next one occur primarily due to the personalization of the world of the literary work in the mind of the reader. The cognitive aspect implies that, in accordance with the general precept, "sentences of utterances that appear in a literary work" that "are not proper judgments, but only quasi-judgments, whose function is to give the depicted objects only a certain aspect of reality, should be perceived, without stamping them with reality" [4, p.179]. The temporal plane of a literary work is phenomenally implemented in the imagination of the reader, where events or different perceptions of one event are gradually overlaid. The cognitive process is aimed at performance of an integral image of the development of some phenomenon and it acquires a semantic completeness in the artistic work when synchronizing all events transformations, existing in the text or ascribed by the reader. Thus, the literary continuum from the fictional plane in the author's conception – through imagination, thought, remembering and reproduction – moves into the mind of the reader. Subsequently, the work acquires a symbolic meaning, germinating additional meanings or their shades: "a work of verbal art, in contrast to its specification, is a schematic work. This means that some of its plans, especially the plans of presented objects, and the plan of images include "the places of non-delineation" [4, p.179]. In fact, the greatest receptive value of a literary and artistic work is the possibility of multiplication of meanings, the realization of an individual reader's understanding, which is entirely based on the continuum of meaning as defined by the author. The distance between the author and the reader increases in proportion to the schematization of the content of the work, and with the expression of the scheme, the reliability of each interpretation increases.

The presence of a literary work in the process of formation, development and implementation of artistic communication is directly correlated with the basic ways of expression of the reader.

## FICTION THROUGH THE AGES

---

Unfolding of the text from one format of the reader's presence to another allows to express the aesthetic and ontological value of the work itself, as well as to understand the relation of the author's primacy in relation to the work, the work in relation to the reader or in return.

According M. Zubrytska, "paradoxical perception of literary texts consists primarily in the fact that artistic communication by its nature and essence is both a complex social phenomenon and deep individualized, personally focused and intimately oriented process" [8, p.177]. The process of reception of the work, initiated by the first reading, is a kind of psychological projection of the personality of the reader. It is directly determined by the extra-literary context, as well as by the level of cultural and aesthetic integration of the individual into the coordinate system, which formats the consistency of both contemporary literature and the attitude and perception of the distant and axiologically different literature of the previous epoch (or epochs). Therefore, there is reason to analyze the reception environment as a concentration of expected reactions and probable estimates of a certain megapersonal community, as a way to implement the vision of literary discourse in its integrity and relevance to the temporal section in the historical sense. The cognitive plane of individual penetration into the meaning of a work is outlined primarily by the social factors, and only then one should observe the way of auto-reader's competence as such. Receptive communication as the next link in the cognitive chain is less egocentric as compared to the first reading: if approaching the meaning rests solely on the empirical experience of the reader, as well as on his or her ability to respond to the author's suggestion, then reception is based on a relatively stable axiological paradigm. Analytical thinking mostly focuses on existing criteria and evaluations, differently verbalized, but invariably synchronous with the existence of artistic and aesthetic communication. We agree that "the artistic dimension is the text, the aesthetic dimension is the process of its perception, which is unthinkable without the subject of reception" [8, p.37]. Indeed, after the exhaustion of purely emotional contact, when the textual array is fully implemented, there comes a moment of cognitive and receptive comprehension / conceptualization – the text is filled with meaning(s), which are so heterogeneous, insofar as the intrinsic personal requests of each recipient are unique.

The semiotically encoded correlation of the real and fictional worlds in the process of penetrating into the semantic depth acquires different modifications; the allowed freedom of understanding has a considerable space for conjecturing meanings, the imaginary ascribing of attributive features and, of course, for the individualized by its own stereotype recognition of the work's images. A remark about the freedom allowed seems important enough in the discourse of reception of the work, since the first reading a priori is free from any restrictions and requirements. The involuntary emergence of figurative and conceptual contact between the text and the reader is beyond various obligations of the tolerant addressee of literary communication: suggesting of emotionally, intellectually or aesthetically meaningful sense relieves the reader of responsibility in front of the historicity of the author and in front of his or her own historicity for the level of established contact or the completeness of the transformed space. Instead, reception must design the evaluation criteria, taking into account the collective aesthetic experience and temporal extent of the work itself: "in the analysis of reception, the subject is an effect, rendered on the individual or collective reader, as well as on the text considered as an incentive" [1, p.174]. Receptive activity should be much more careful than the first reading, though its result is also much more productive in terms of the

## FICTION THROUGH THE AGES

---

meaning of the work. The reason is primarily the accumulation of knowledge about the text, about the work, about the author, as well as about the whole set of factors that have formed certain contours of literary communication. The peculiarity of literary and artistic discourse is that “one text is potentially capable of several different realizations, and no single reading can ever exhaust all the potential possibilities, since each individual reader will fill in the gaps in the text on his/her own, eliminating many other possibilities; in the reading process he/she makes his own choice of how to fill the lacuna. In addition, it is in the act of this choice that the dynamics of reading is revealed. When making a choice, the reader openly acknowledges the inexhaustibility of the text, but at the same time it is the inexhaustibility that compels him/her to make his/her own choice” [5, p.354].

At the same time, one should think about the completeness of “gaps” or “lacunae” in the cognitive space. By exaggerating their multiplicity, we run the risk of losing touch with the original meaning of the work, creating a fictitious reception of the fictional world. A receptive scheme should predict the likelihood or presence of multiple readings of the text in terms of understanding its content and, in turn, offer the most optimal semantic paradigm. Characteristics and contextual knowledge of the author’s historicity have the opportunity to bring the receptive efforts out of numerous hypothetical ideas about the literary work.

It is important that the next step after the first reading is synthetic by its nature and more complicated (from the standpoint of cognitive narratology) in implementation, since it must take into account rather unexpected turns in the perception and understanding of the literary work. As M. Zubrytska points out, “the forms of the reception process are not only articulation and verbalization, but also silence... Silence is not only an indispensable attribute of the reading process, it also has a significant functional purpose in the structure of the text – it increases the tension of the reception load, expresses the receptive background, identifies anomalies of the receptive landscape, or outlines the topology of the unspeakable. Silence favors the position of *homo legens*. It is the reader who otherwise “voices” the silence of the writing and brings to light from the depths of the text something that the author’s imagination did not even foresee” [8, p.327]. The paradox of literary dialogue is observed in the plane of being able to make individual contact – by and large, it is always the voice of one person. In the real sound of the author’s speech, the verbalized portrait of the reader has no definition, the author’s appeal is quite rhetorical. Encoded sense expects its understanding, but this hope is of approximate and desirable, but not mandatory nature, because cognitive synchronization cannot be provided by fictitious parameters. The receptive component of the process of reading the literary work is the voice of the reader only. Therefore, the full concentration of oneself in the matrix of the work, the depth of insight and approach to the author’s challenge or invitation to dialogue is the responsibility of the reader. The silence of one of the interlocutors, in addition to waiting for some desired feedback, is important for formatting the openness of the conceptual space: “having the ability to concentrate a huge amount information on the “plane” of very short text, the artistic text has another feature: it gives different readers different information – as far as each of them understands, it also gives the reader a language that can be used to absorb the next batch of information when read again. It behaves like a living organism that feedbacks with the reader and trains this reader” [6, p.33]. Thus, the silence of the author turns to a kind of cognitive polyphony of readers: being in a given ontological context, the reception is able to cover the circle of the most authentic variants of the meanings of the work. The first reading

## FICTION THROUGH THE AGES

---

may be a competition for approaching the intention, but the reception must accumulate the author's intention as much as the author himself encourages and as much as much the reader's historicity requires an appeal to an omniscience of the meaning.

The problem of the cognitive specificity of the reception of the literary work is directly related to the concept of "*a work in motion*", characterized by U. Eco: "if you slowly rotate the lens of a polaroid, the projected figure begins to consistently change its colors, passing through the whole spectrum of rainbow colors and reacting through different chromatic layers of flexible materials in a series of transformations, which is manifested in the most flexible structure of the form. By rotating the lens at will, the recipient actually cooperates in the creation of an aesthetic object, at least within the field of possibilities, which determines the range of colors and the tendency of slides to flexibility" [2, p.534]. That is, if the author's voice focuses at some time on creating a dynamic and plastic artistic array, then the voice of the reader will be able to adequately interpret the creator's silence. Thus, the cognitive and receptive plane synchronizes the intentions for rooting the meaning in the text with the knowledge of that meaning, while leaving the author the right to hope for the understanding of the concept, and for the reader – the duty to listen to all explicitly or implicitly present «voices»: of the author, of the context, of the historicity in the perception of the work by different readers, including different generations of readers. Being one-dimensional and personal at the time of artistic creation, the author's voice, as the beginning of literary communication, is gradually split into numerous shades of sound: "it is risky to claim that a metaphor or poetic symbol, acoustic reality, or plastic form is a more perfect instrument of knowing reality than those offered by logic. Perceiving the world in science has its own permissible path, and every impulse of the artist towards insight, even when it is poetically fruitful, always has something ambiguous. In addition to the fact that art *perceives* the world, it also *produces* the addition of the world, revealing its own laws and living its own life. Every art form is best regarded, if not as a substitute for scientific knowledge, but an epistemological metaphor: that is, in every century the way of creating art form reflects through assimilation, metaphorization and concept image as such the way of seeing the reality by the science and culture of this particular era" [2, p.536]. The dialogue through the literary work always goes beyond the actual textual meaning – far beyond the horizons available at some point and thus increases the reader's receptive capacity. The process of reading after first acquaintance with a literary work undergoes much more noticeable and significant pressure of context, requires not only perception and accustoming to the artistic world, but the involvement of accessible intellectual and analytical tools to penetrate the content hidden in the text. At this stage, it is extremely important to assimilate the initial impression into a comprehensive understanding so harmoniously as not to lose the aesthetic appeal and uniqueness of the work, but also to articulate its meaning as accurately as possible. Thus, "how to reintegrate semantics into ontology without being affected by objections... Reflection is an intermediate stage in the direction of existence, in other words, the connection between understanding of the sign and self-understanding... With such an interpretation, I propose to overcome alienation, the distance between the past cultural age to which the text belongs, and self-understanding. Overcoming this distance, returning to understanding the text, exegesis can make sense; alienated, it can return to the true, in other words, to being; only by expanding the true self-understanding the Other can be understood. All hermeneutics is also, explicitly or implicitly, a self-understanding through the return to



understanding the Other” [7, p.298]. Thus, if the first reading is a way to look for oneself-in-the-text (which provides outlining of cognitive horizon), the reception may be the search for a work-in-the-text (which enables the cognitive component dominate wool in the creation of meanings). The ability to balance the challenges of the author and the needs of the reader, the ability to truly project the author’s silence on the voice of the reader, and vice versa, the integrity of contextual knowledge – these and some other factors are considered most important for establishing the optimal receptive system, for finding the scheme of decoding the primary meaning of the literary work in the process of concretizing the cognitive chain.

Despite the multiplicity and complexity of integrated interpretation of aesthetic and artistic phenomenon, the cognitive aspects of scientific discourse make it possible to observe the sequence, integrity of perception and close pursuit of the primary matrix of the meaning in the literary work. Unraveling the semiotic nature of an image or symbol occurs according to the rules set by the interpreters themselves, that is, the imaginary meanings are first formulated and then they acquire value in the format of understanding. The integrity of the cognitive chain makes it possible to avoid the loss or incredible distance from the setpoint, so a perfect interpretation as the completion of the receptive process should take into account all probable and valid challenges of the text. An important fact is that each interpreter is primarily the reader, therefore the prospect of understanding has a clear individualized direction – it relies on the cognitive and emotional perception, which is later defined as coordinates of evaluative attitude, and further – becomes the basis for formatting the analytical research process.

### References:

1. Compagnon, A. (2001). *The Demon of Theory*. Izd-vo Sabashnikovyh.
2. Eco, U. (2001). The Poetics of the Open Work. In M. Zubrytska (Ed.), *Word. Symbol. Discourse: An Anthology of Literary and Critical Thought in the 20th Century* (pp. 525–538). Litopys.
3. Eco, U. (2001). Rhetoric and Ideology. In M. Zubrytska (Ed.), *Word. Symbol. Discourse: An Anthology of Literary and Critical Thought in the 20th Century* (pp. 539–548). Litopys.
4. Ingarden, R. (2001). The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art. In M. Zubrytska (Ed.), *Word. Symbol. Discourse: An Anthology of Literary and Critical Thought in the 20th Century* (pp. 176–208). Litopys.
5. Iser, W. (2001). The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach. In M. Zubrytska (Ed.), *Word. Symbol. Discourse: An Anthology of Literary and Critical Thought in the 20th Century* (pp. 349–368). Litopys.
6. Lotman, Yu. (1970). *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. Iskusstvo.
7. Ricoeur, P. (2001). The Conflict of Interpretations. In M. Zubrytska (Ed.), *Word. Symbol. Discourse: An Anthology of Literary and Critical Thought in the 20th Century* (pp. 288–304). Litopys.
8. Zubrytska, M. (2004). *Homo legens: Reading as a Sociocultural Phenomenon*. Litopys.