

stages of the communicative event. The definition of strategy and tactic is considered. An attempt is made to determine the communicative strategies and tactics of the Witness as an addressee in the witnesses questioning process during the committees' meeting. Comparison of strategic and tactical arsenal of Witnesses in the Parliament of the Great Britain and in the US Congress is made. Thus, the author concludes that the chosen cooperative strategy for speech communication is common to both Witnesses. Tactics of the cooperative strategy realization are common and different. 15 common tactics were identified: tactics of supposition, generalization, clarification, confirmation / consent, providing additional information, rhetorical question, reference / quoting, clarification / reciprocal, correction, fact, objection / disagreement, redirection, ignorance, self-presentation, promise. The tactic of the presentation is identified in the tactic arsenal of the Witness in the Parliament of Great Britain. For the cooperative strategy realization the Witness in the US Congress uses five more tactics, with the exception of the above-mentioned tactics common with the Witness in the Parliament of Great Britain, namely the tactic of reaction, request, own understanding, changing the topic focus, approval. The ranking of tactics, which are most often used by Witnesses for the cooperative strategy realization, is determined. Strategies and tactics of speech communication are embodied in speech acts that form discourses (texts) as units of communication. In turn, speech acts are realized by language (lexical, grammatical and stylistic) and non-native means.

Key words: communicative strategy, communicative tactics, parliamentary discourse, addressee.

УДК 8020-5 (025)

Oleksandr Beliakov

NARRATORIAL INSTANCE IN THE LENS OF HISTORICAL POETICS

The article deals with the evolution of a narratorial instance within the framework of historical poetics. The latter is understood in the lens of the ideas of M. Bakhtin and S. Broytman. The narrator is known to be one of the three anthropocenters responsible for story-telling of any kind. The others are the author and the reader. The author and the reader both inhabit the real world, it is the author's function to create the alternate world, people, and events within the story. It is the reader's function to understand and interpret the story. The narrator exists within the world of the story and presents it in a way the reader can comprehend. This claim is an initial standpoint of our approach to a narrator as the agent of literary communication.

The status and function of the narrator are historically variable. They changed and developed in the course of literary evolution. The cultural and historical experience of human being can be divided into three epochs: the epoch of syncretism, the epoch of eidetic culture, the epoch of artistic modality. The narrative situations employed by the writers of the eidetic modality epoch are authorial (with a dominant external perspective) or first-person with the prevailing role of the narrator who belongs to the fictive world and who narrates a story from the perspective of a participant. During the epoch of artistic modality the narrator becomes invisible and is replaced by a figurate narrative medium (F. Stanzel). The epoch of artistic modality is characterized by a removal of the narrator from the fictive world and a delegation of focalization (G. Genette's terminology) to the character.

In the focus of the research is the effect of self-reflexivity and the "arranger" (H. Kenner) in the writers of the periods of modernism and postmodernism. The research demonstrates the literary precursor-successor relations in terms of the characteristics of a narratorial instance across the three trajectories of historical poetics.

Key words: epoch of eidetic poetics, epoch of artistic modality, narratorial instance, evolution, precursor-successor relationship, self-reflexivity, arranger.

Formulation of the research problem and its significance. The evolution of science, technology and literature has always attracted researchers as it gave them numerous possibilities for comparative analysis, diachronic investigations and perspectives for further development modeling. There are a number of highly elaborated classifications of all literary periods, trends, schools and their representatives. Yet, we find very few attempts to classify, and track down the development of one of the key notions of literary communication-narrator.

This research is targeted at investigating the evolution of the narrator's status within a framework of historical poetics. This field of literary critical studies enables us to explore the evolution of a narratorial instance, to compare the status of narrator in literary works of the writers belonging to different periods of history and to reveal differences and similarities between the narrations of the historical context and to provide a synergy of narratology and historical poetics.

Analysis of the research into this problem of a narratorial instance. In our research we draw upon a lot valuable insights generated by such scholars as L. Sikorska [19], A. Fowler [14], I. Bekhta [3], B. Richardson [18], F. K. Stanzel [21], M. Wallace [24], O. Tkachuk [7], O. Huz [6].

Though a lot has been done in the area we are concerned with, a few issues still remain open.

One of them is a search for a common denominator of a lot of tendencies in fiction. This denominator is S. N. Broytman's version of historical poetics, as a discipline that explores the genesis and development of an aesthetic entity as well as its architectonics (a narrator is its integral part).

Hitherto there has been a gap between narratology and historical poetics. This research is an attempt to build a bridge between the scholarly domains.

The goal of the research is 1) to offer a version of a key tendency in the evolution of a narratorial instance, to demonstrate a literary precursor - successor relations between the writers representing the same literary trend (tendency) and belonging to different phases of the history of poetics. In the foreground of the research is the effect of self-reflexivity (metafiction) and the function of the arranger in literature of modernism; 2) to prove that, first, the dynamics of a narratorial instance depends upon a historically motivated switch in the manner of thinking and in the techniques of reflecting the reality, and, second, that the mainstream tendency in the narrator's position and function consists in the fusion of the author and narrator via the dominant role of the author to the prevalence of the narrator.

One final remark to close our comments on the rationale of the research. We are certainly aware of inevitable epistemological losses in the course of the research: the amount of the illustration material is boundless, the controversy over each narratological term is huge. We believe, however that it is possible to detect (in the history of literature) what M. Bakhtin would call "the points of relative typological stability" [2, p. 48].

Statement regarding the basic material of the research and the justification of the results obtained. Brian Richardson, an expert in the history of the novel and theory of literary narrative pointed in his monograph to two main features standing out "in the development of fictional technique since Defoe: the exploration of subjectivity and the unreliable narrator" [18, p. 1].

Our research is to a certain extent similar to and different from that of B. Richardson. *Similar* because we make an attempt to analyze the narratorial instance in the evolutionary terms, that is, as M. Bakhtin formulated, "intrinsically and teleologically motivated overlapping succession" [1, p. 22] (Translation is mine: O. O.). *Different*, because in our theoretical assumptions we proceed from historical poetics defined as a critical tradition "blending literary theory, history of poetic forms, cultural history, and philosophical aesthetics" [<https://www.jstor.org>] and, we would add, narratology.

Historical development of American and English literary tradition. As long as the human's brain started to comprehend the world formation and tried to differentiate the place of a human being in it, there appeared certain culturally and historically predetermined models. These models were peculiar to the whole human kind and penetrated into different spheres of human's activity. S. Broytman, an expert in historical poetics, differentiates three main epochs in the development of literature and culture:

- 1) the epoch of syncretism;
- 2) the epoch of eidetic culture;
- 3) the epoch of literary modality [5, p. 36; 4, p. 5–41].

The epoch of syncretism comprises the time span from pre-historic times to the antique times. In the epoch of syncretism the world was looked on as the unity of the nature and the human being which is eloquently illustrated by the ancient myth. There was no differentiation between the literary and scientific perception of human being and nature.

A human was a part of a larger natural unity. Thus, there was an extensive "humanization" of natural phenomena. This epoch was characterized by the following features:

- anonymity and the absence of the author;
- entities of author, narrator, protagonist were merged;
- it was almost impossible to apply certain classification patterns and distinguish the types of narrators.

For the obvious (historically motivated) reasons we leave this period outside the scope of this research.

The epoch of eidetic culture started in the 5th century and lasted up to the middle of the 18th century. The term "eidos" introduced by Plato means "form, essence, type, species". The merging of image and meaning is characteristic of this epoch. The value of human beings is comprehended by their devotion to a certain idea.

The period of eidetic poetics embraces the following literary periods [6, p. 8–14]:

1. Ancient literature (6th c. BC – 5th c. AD)
2. Middle ages (5th c. – 13th c.)

3. Pre-Renaissance (13th c.)
4. Renaissance (14th c. – 17th c.)
5. Classicism (17th c.)
6. Enlightenment (18th c.)

I will briefly outline a few basic principles of each period of the eidetic epoch. The ancient period marked the understanding the importance of civilization in human life and the presence of an idea that united people in groups, tribes and later state formations. Antique poets praised a human and proved that the human being should be in the center of the value system of the world. The perception of world was anthropocentric and focused on humanization of nature.

The world perception of the Middle Ages was theocentric. A human being is considered weak and subordinated to the spiritual entity of God. The main tendency of this period is a spiritual enrichment of the human beings and a splint of the world perception into spiritual and materialistic spheres.

The Pre-Renaissance era incorporated features of two preceding periods: the antique importance of a human and the medieval greatness of God. This period laid foundation of the development of humanism that became the major idea of the next cultural and literary period – the Renaissance.

The Renaissance declared independence and the unique nature of a human being. The human being personality was put in the center of value system. The literary heroes of this period fought for their independence in spite of hard everyday life situations.

The periods of Classicism and Enlightenment were characterized by the rational approach to the world, belief in progress, development of pragmatism – truth measured by practical experience, law of nature, idealism – conviction that there is a universal sense of right and wrong; belief in essential goodness of man and interest in human nature.

The corner stone of the eidetic epoch was the emergence of the personified authorship and the evolution of the status of protagonist. Over the course of the time the protagonist gained its relative independence from the author.

The key characteristic of eidetic poetics: a mounting role of indirect varieties of the characters speech representation (Cf.: the dominance of direct speech in the epoch of syncretism). In European literature this tendency had two vectors: “linear” and “pictorial” [1; 2]. The former involves a distinct and unambiguous border between the author’s and the character’s contours of speech. The latter results in blurring the explicit distinctions between the author’s and the character’s passages. Another feature of eidetic poetics is the onslaught of the omniscient (all-knowing) author’s context on the character’s enunciation.

It must be emphasized that the development of English literature was demonstrating at its early stage, the prevalence of a linear style of speech representation (the Middle Ages). Later, during the period of Enlightenment, the pictorial mode gained prominence, whereas the 17th and 18th centuries testify to the domination of the linear type of speech representation.

In Chaucer’s “Canterbury Tales”, the characters tell tales suited to their personalities and tell them in ways that highlight their personalities. The noble knights tells a noble story, the boring character tells a very dull tale and the rude miller tells a smutty tale.

The third person narrator in “The Canterbury Tales” is straightforwardly and fully subordinated to the author. The narrator acts merely as a transponder of the author’s thoughts and perceptions.

Twenty nine characters set to tell their stories, each one twice on the way to Canterbury and the way back. Individual stories are preceded by narrator’s prologue. Harry Bailey, the host of the Tabart Inn functions here as an organizing principle: he is the one who gives voice to individual speakers. It should admitted, though, that the signs of the effect of self-reflexivity (it gains dominance during the period of literary poetics modality) can be identified in Chaucer’s work.

L. Sikorska with (reference to F. Robinson) reminds us of how Chaucer is silenced by the host: “By God, quod he”, for plainly, in a word, thy drasty, rhyming is not worth a toord” [12, p. 81].

The period of Enlightenment is represented by the works of Daniel Defoe and Jonathan Swift. This period is characterized by the employment of the first person narrative.

The first-person point of view sacrifices omniscience and omnipresence for a greater intimacy with one character. It allows the reader to see what is in the focus of a character, it also allows that character to be further developed through his own style in telling the story. First-person narrations may be told like third

person ones; on the other hand, the narrator may be conscious of telling the story to a given audience, perhaps at a given place and time, for a given reason. In extreme cases, the first-person narration may be told as a story within a story, with the narrator appearing as a character in the frame story.

If a story is told within another story, rather than being told as a part the plot, the motives and the reliability of the storyteller are automatically in question. The original author is often regarded as truthful even if he is telling fiction whereas an internal teller may alter or disguise details to make himself appear better. This flexibility allows the author to play on the readers' perceptions of the characters.

In a first person narrative, the narrator is a character in the story. This character takes actions, makes judgments and has opinions and biases. In this case the narrator gives and withholds information based on his or her viewing of events.

This type of narrator is usually marked by the first-person pronoun.

The first-person narrator is commonly associated with non-fictional literary forms such as biography, memoirs or diaries. When used in fictional works is in J. Swift's "Robinson Crusoe" it lends authenticity, creating the illusion that the narrator is relating events that he has personally witnessed or experienced. As the reader 'sees the world through the narrator's eyes', he is often encouraged to identify and empathize with the narrator.

But the great allowances should be given to a King who lives wholly secluded from the rest of the world, and must therefore be altogether unacquainted with the manners and customs that most prevail in other nations: the want of which knowledge will ever produce many prejudices, and a certain narrowness of thinking, from which we and politer countries of Europe are wholly exempted [12, p. 59].

The first-person narration is subjective and biased, which causes the narrator's unreliability (fallibility), because his or her interpretation and evaluation of events do not coincide with the beliefs hold by the author. In Part 2 of "Gulliver's Travels" the narrator informs the King of the benefits of gun powder and wonders of the reaction of Monarch: "The King was struck with horror... he was amazed. A strand effect of narrow principles and short views!" Gulliver can't realize how the King could "let slip of opportunity to put into his hands, then would have made him absolute master of the lives... of the people" [12, p. 61].

Using the terminology of F. K. Stanzel [21], we can distinguish the narrative situations employed by the writers of the eidetic epoch as auctorial (with a dominant external perspective) or first-person (Ich-Erzählsituation) where the teller as the character belongs to the narrated fictional world and recounts the events from the perspective of a participant. In other words, in an auctorial narrative situation the external perspective dominates (for example, in Charles Dickens' "Dombey and Son"), whereas in a first-person narrative situation the fictive world is foregrounded (for example, in Henry Fielding's "The History of Tom Jones, Foundling"). These narrative situations roughly correspond with G. Genette's terms "heterodiegetic narrator" (who tells a story not about him (herself) and "homodiegetic narrator" (who shares the characters' spacio-temporal world).

The 18th century marks the beginning of the epoch of the **artistic literary modality**. This century brought significant changes to the literary tradition of depicting a human being. The literature is now focused on emotion and feelings of a personality, moral values that help a human being to grow and act as an all-sufficient personality.

This period depicts a human being as a personality with its unique features, emotions, successes and failures. Personal "I" stands in the center of literary texts. However, if the literature of the previous epochs depicted a static type of a hero, the period of literary modality introduced a dynamic and unpredictable literary help that is in constant search not only of its place but also trying to comprehend people surrounding it.

The epoch of artistic modality includes the following periods in literature:

1. Romanticism (1820–1861)
2. Realism (1860–1890)
3. Modernism (1914–1945)
4. Post-modernism (after 1945)

This epoch is characterized by a removal of the narrator from the fictive world and a delegation of focalization to the characters. This variety of a narrative situation is categorized as "figural" (F. K. Stanzel), where, as in J. Joyce's "A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man" or in W. Woolf's

“Mrs. Dalloway”, the narrator becomes invisible and his or her place is taken by a figural medium or reflector-character (Stephen Dedalus, Clarissa Dalloway). This is how F. K. Stanzel comments on a historical context of this manner of writing: “...the figural novel made its appearance late in the history of the novel: around the second half of the nineteenth century. Once invented, it became prominent in a very short time. Three factors contributed to its development: a philosophical principle (the desire for objectivity), a narratological innovation (the strict and consistent application of one and the same perspective), and a new theme (the conscious and subconscious)” [11, p. 68].

I would like to take a detour now and to demonstrate the literary precursor-successor relationship between the writers belonging to the eidetic poetics epoch and the epoch of poetic modality.

For example, Laurence Sterne’s “The Life and Opinions of Tristan Shandy” (1767) was ahead of its time. The hero is not born until book V and digression outnumber relevancy. The book gives us very little and nothing of the opinions of the nominal hero. The novel looks like “a physical object not as a transcendental one” [19, p. 268]. Word plays, jests, parodies form the linguistic content of the novel, highlighting the seemingly chaotic development of the plot based on associations, and drawing attention to the novel as an artifact. It is told by the “self-conscious narrator” [23], who shatters any illusion that he or she is telling something that has actually happened by revealing to the reader that the narration is a work of fictional art or by eliminating the difference between fictionality and reality.

Another stage of destabilizing the conventional status of a narrator in the present-day literature of postmodernism is referred to as a “self-begetting novel” (S. G. Kellman’s term). The roots of this narrative situation can be found in as early as 1848 when William Thackeray published his “Vanity Fair”. Its narrator is omniscient, although, as a character, his information cannot be trustworthy.

The narrator of this novel is a puppeteer who pulls the strings of his characters-actors, besides, he is a non-involved witness, an intrusive person who addresses the reader forgetting the characters and a participant squeezed into the coach where his characters ride commenting on their conversation. The narrator addresses himself in the 3rd person when he says: “it was at that the present writer had the pleasure of hearing the tale”. The narrator, according to A. Fowler “flirts with the responsibilities of omniscience, even while his narrator flaunts a light untrustworthy indifference to facts” [14, p. 298]

A similar effect of self-reflexivity is produced by the authorial narrator in John Fowles’ “The French Lieutenant’s Woman”. In Chapter 55 the narrator, the 20th century type, disguises himself as a Victorian gentleman and transports himself to 1867, the times of Victorian England, to the railroad carriage occupied by Charles, the novel’s protagonist.

A few paragraphs later the narrator is ruminating over the function of fiction:

“Fiction usually pretends to conform to the reality: the writer puts the conflicting wants in the ring and then describes the fight” [15, p. 348].

Metafictional writers explore the relationship between fiction and reality whereby the writers want to convey fictional characters that only exist in the text, the text being their only reality [25]. The reality of the fictional world is a linguistic reality only, which contrasts with classical fiction in which fiction represents reading. In case of metafiction, the real world only exists outside the text. There are metafictional texts that often include metafictional passages together (Kurt Vonnegut, John Barth, William S. Burroughs) and selecting a narrative strategy, whereas a narrator “carries out the decision of the arranger and manifests the arranger’s fictional world in language” [20, p. 67].

For example, in J. Joyce’s “Ulysses” the arranger uses the narrative devices that divert readers from their experience of the narrative to their experience of reading the text. In “Hades” the arranger shows up while the men wait in their carriage to follow Paddy Dignam’s corpse to the country:

All waited. Then wheels were heard from in front, turning: then nearer: then horses’ hoofs. A jolt. Their carriage began to move, creaking and swaying. Other hoofs and creaking wheels started behind. The blinds of the avenue passed and number nine with its craped knocker, door ajar. At walking pace [16, p. 96–97].

Bloom’s experiences here, both sensual and conceptual, are presented with such immediacy in the interior monologue that readers admire the novelty of the passage and savor the experience of having read it. The arranger invites readers to enjoy their own experiences over those of the fictive characters.

The arranger becomes a ubiquitous entity in “Finnegans Wake”, Joyce’s most innovative prose

work written in a revolutionary narrative style. The exact identity of the narrator (a person who is dreaming) is ambivalent. Possibilities are that the dreamer is H.C.E., or one of his family members, or the mythic avatar, Finn MacCoul or that the dreamer is Joyce himself, or the reader, or Joyce and the reader together (all combinations are possible).

The self-reflexive strategy of the arranger is obvious in the frame structure of *Finnegans Wake*. The opening (“riverrun”) and closing (“loved a long the”) lines of the novel merge into the circularity of a single sentence that at once ends and begins the work (a metaphor for the book’s cyclical pattern that transcends the verisimilitude of linear representation).

The material of the research allows me to assume that the repertoire of narrator’s (arranger’s) self-reflexivity during the epoch of literary modality is broad. It includes the narrators visibly engaged in the act of composition (J. Barth’s “Lost in the Funhouse”); direct address to the reader in K. Vonnegut’s “Slaughterhouse 5” (though D. Lodge argues that from the beginning of the 20th century the intrusive narrator fell out of favor), artistic modeling the narrator’s altered states of consciousness (oneiric discourse inclusive) in W. S. Burroughs’ “Naked Lunch” and I. Welsh’s “Trainspotting”; ostentatious manipulation of focalizations adopted by multiple narrators (W. Faulkner’s “The Sound and the Fury” and T. Morrison’s “Beloved”); a writer as a participant of the novel’s fictive world (J. Fowles’ “The French Lieutenant’s Woman”); unreliable narrators (Holden Caulfield in J. D. Salinger’s “The Catcher in the Rye”, Benjy in W. Faulkner’s “The Sound and the Fury”, Nick Carraway in F. S. Fitzgerald’s “The Great Gatsby”, the unnamed governess in Henry James’ “The Turn of The Screw”).

A scholarly overview of a large number of innovative contemporary uses of narrators (fraudulent, contradictory, incommensurate and disframed narrators (under the “umbrella term” of unreliable narrators) and the whole array of odd, unusual or impossible speakers, such as conflated, quasi-human, non-human and anti-human narrators) can be found [18].

Special emphasis should be placed on hypertext narrators (as J. Joyce’s “Afternoon, a Story”).

The latter should be analyzed with due regard to a spatial dimension of a piece of prose, ludic mode of reading as well as to semantic, structural and visual instability [4].

Conclusions and prospects for further research.

1. Narrator is a person or agent who narrates, who tells a story, whether factual or fictional. A narrator is distinct and inherent agent of fictional narrative and narrative transmission.

2. The status of the narrator is historically variable. It changed and developed in the course of literary evolution. The literary evolution comprises three benchmark periods: the epoch of syncretism, eidetic culture and artistic modality (S. Broytman).

3. The dynamics and development of the instance of the narrator depends upon a historically motivated switch in thinking and the techniques of reflecting the reality.

4. The narrative situations employed by the writers of the eidetic epoch (6–7 cc B.C. – mid-18th c) is authorial (with a dominant external perspective) or first-person with the prevailing role of the narrator who belongs to the “possible world” of a novel and who narrates a story from the perspective of a participant of the events.

5. The epoch of artistic (poetic) modality is characterized by a removal of the narrator from the fictive world, and by a delegation of focalization to the characters.

6. In the historical stage of artistic modality the narrator becomes invisible and is replaced by a “figural” narrative medium or a reflector-character who thinks, feels and perceives building up an illusion of immediacy (F. Stanzel).

7. The epoch of poetic modality is characterized by self-reflexivity (metafiction), the signs of which can be traced in the novels of L. Sterne and W. Thackeray (the writers of the preceding epoch).

8. The extreme outcome of self-reflexivity is the entity of the “arranger”.

9. The repertoire of self-reflexivity comprises, for example, ostentatious manipulation of focalizations adopted by multiple characters and fallible narrators.

10. The literary works of the 20th – early 21st centuries contain a variety of “odd, unusual and impossible speakers” (B. Richardson), hypertext narrators, inclusive.

The prospects for further research include unifying the criteria of comparison and classification; resorting to cognitive narratology.

Bibliography

1. Бахтин М. М. Эстетика словесного творчества / М. М. Бахтин. – М. : Искусство, 1979. – 424 с.
2. Бахтин М. М. Литературно-критические статьи / М. М. Бахтин. – М. : Худож. лит., 1986. – 543 с.
3. Бехта І. А. Дискурс наратора в англійській прозі / І. А. Бехта. – К. : Грамота, 2004. – 304 с.
4. Беляков О. О. Специфіка гіпертекстової комунікації (на матеріалі гіперроману Дж. Джойса «Полудень, легенда») / О. О. Беляков // Науковий вісник Волин. держ. ун-ту імені Лесі Українки. – Луцьк : РВВ «Вежа ВДУ ім. Лесі Українки, 2007. – № 3. – С. 124–129.
5. Бройтман, С. Н. Историческая поэтика. Историческая поэтика : учеб. пособ. / С. Н. Бройтман. – М. : РГГУ, 2001. – 320 с.
6. Гузь О. О. Від міфу до постмодернізму / О. Гузь. – Тернопіль : Мандрівець, 2007. – 208 с.
7. Ткачук О. М. Наратологічний словник / О. Ткачук. – Тернопіль : Астон, 2002. – 173 с.
8. Abrams A. Glossary of Literary Terms. – 6th ed. – Harcourt : Brace College, 1999. – 366 p.
9. Barth J. Lost in the Funhouse / John Barth. – New York : Anchor Books, 1988. – 201 p.
10. Booth A. The Norton Introduction to Literature / Alison Booth, J. Paul Hunter, Kelli J. Mays. – NY ; L : W. W. Norton & Company, 2005. – 2328 p.
11. De Jong J. F. The Origins of Figural Narration in Antiquity / Iryne J. F. de Jong // New Perspectives on Narrative Perspective / ed. by Willie Van Peer and Seymour Chartman. – Albany : State University of New York Press, 2001. – 398 p.
12. Delaney D. Ward. Fields of Vision / Denis Delaney, Ciaran Ward, Carla Rho Fiorina. – Harlow : Pearson Education Limited, 2003. – Vol. 2. – 210 p.
13. Fargnoli A. N. James Joyce A to Z: the Essential Reference to his Life and Writings / A. Nicholas Fargnoli, Michael Patrick Gillespie. – New York : Oxford University Press, 1996. – 304 p.
14. Fowler A. History of English Literature / Alastair Fowler. – Oxford : Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1989. – 409 p.
15. Fowles J. The French Lieutenant's Woman / John Fowles. – London : Triad Panther, 1985. – 399 p.
16. Genette G. Narrative Discourse / G. Genette. – Oxford : Basic Blackwell, 1986. – 286 p.
17. Joyce J. Ulysses / James Joyce. – Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1985. – 720 p.
18. Richardson B. Unnatural Voices Extreme Narration in Modern and Contemporary Fiction. Literary Criticism / B. Richardson. – Columbus : Ohio State University, 2006. – 168 p.
19. Sikorska L. A. Short History of English Literature / Liliana Sikorska. – Poznan : Wydawnictwo Poznańskie, 2011. – 777 p.
20. Somer J. The Self-Reflexive Arranges in the initial style of Joyce's "Ulysses" / John Somer. – Vol. 31. – No. 2. – Winter. – 1994. – P. 65–79.
21. Stanzel F. K. A Theory of Narrative / Frants Stanzel. – Cambridge : Cambridge UP, 1986. – 308 p.
22. Stoicheff P. The Chaos of Metafiction / Peter Stoicheff // Chaos and Order: complex dynamics in Literature and Science / edited by N. Katherine Hayles. – Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1991. – P. 85–99.
23. Stonehill B. The Self-Conscious Novel / Brian Stonehill. – Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988. – 221 p.
24. Wallace M. Recent Theories of Narrative / Martin Wallace. – Ithaca : Cornell. UP, 1986. – 242 p.
25. Waugh P. Metafiction. The theory and Practice of Selfconscious Novel / Patricia Waugh. – L. and NY : Methuen, 1984. – 176 p.

References

1. Bahtyn, M. M. 1979. *Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva*. Moskva.
2. Bahtyn, M. M. 1986. *Literaturno-kriticheskie stati*. Moskva.
3. Bekhta, I. A. 2004. *Dyskurs naratora v anhlomovniy prozi*. Kyiv: Hramota.
4. Belyakov, O. O. 2007. "Spetsyfika hipertekstovoi komunikatsii (na materialy hiperromanu Dzh. Dzhoisa "Poluden, lehenda")". *Naukovyi visnyk Volyn. derzh. un-tu imeni Lesi Ukrainky*, 3: 124–129. Lutsk: RVV "Vezha" VDU im. Lesi Ukrainky.
5. Broitman, S. N. 2001. *Istoricheskaia poetika*. Moskva: RGGU.
6. Huz, O. O. 2007. *Vid mifu do postmodernizmu*. Ternopil: Mandrivets.
7. Tkachuk, O. M. 2002. *Naratolohichniy slovnyk*. Ternopil: Aston.
8. Abrams, Meger Howard, 1999. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Harcourt: Brace College.
9. Barth, John. 1988. *Lost in the Funhouse*. New York: Anchor Books.
10. Booth, Alison, and Hunter, J. Paul. 2005. *The Norton Introduction to Literature*. NY; L: W. W. Norton & Company.
11. De Jong, and Irene, J. F. 2001 "The origins of Figural Narration in Antiquity". *New Perspectives on Narrative Perspective*, edited by Willie Van Peer and Seymour Chartman. Albany: State University of New York Press.
12. Delaney, Denis, and Ward, Ciaran. 2003. *Fields of vision*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

13. Fargnoli, A. N., and Gillespie, M. P. Micheal Patrick. *James Joyce A to Z: The Essential Reference to His Life and Writings*. New York: Oxford University Press.
14. Fowler, Alastair. 1989. *A History of English Literature*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
15. Fowles, Jon. 1985. *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. London: Triad Panther.
16. Genette, Gerard. 1986. *Narrative Discourse*. Oxford: Basic Blackwell.
17. Joyce, James. 1985. *Ulysses*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
18. Richardson, Brian. 2006. *Unnatural Voices Extreme Narration in Modern and Contemporary Fiction. Literary Criticism*. Columbus: Ohio State University.
19. Sikorska, Liliana. 2011. *Short History Of English Literature*. Poznan: Wydawnictwo Poznanske.
20. Somer, John. 1994. *The Self-Reflexive Arranges in the initial style of Joyce's "Ulysses"*, 31(2): 65–79. Wiater.
21. Stanzel, F.K. 1986. *A Theory of Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
22. Stoicheff, Peter. 1991. "The Chaos of Metafiction". *Chaos and Order: complex dynamics in Literature and Science*, 85–99. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
23. Stonehill, B. 1988. *The Self-Conscious Novel*. Philadelphia: University of Penns. Press.
24. Wallace, M. 1986. *Recent Theories of Narrative*. Ithaca: Cornell. UP.
25. Waugh, Patricia. 1984. *Metafiction. The theory and Practice of Self conscious Novel*. L; NY: Methuen.

Беляков Олександр. Інстанція наратора як об'єкт історичної поетики. У статті розглядається еволюція інстанції наратора з огляду на три стадії історії поетики: епоха синкретизму, епоха ейдетичної поетики та епоха художньої модальності (С. Н. Бройтман).

Найпоширенішою в ейдетичній поетиці є аукторальна наративна ситуація: оповідач зберігає дистанцію стосовно зображуваного світу, не є персонажем (діючою особою) цього твору; оповідач лише розмірковує щодо подій або надає спорадичні метанаративні коментарі. Крім цього, ейдетична поетика знає першоособову форму нарації, коли оповідач належить до художнього світу, (що ним зображується), і виступає як повістьяр, котрий сприймає точку зору учасника подій.

Нейтральна або персональна ситуація, при якій «фігуральний» оповідач прагне відсторонити себе від подій, про які йдеться, і делегувати точку зору власне персонажам, притаманна епосі художньої модальності.

На конкретних прикладах художніх творів, що репрезентують літературу середніх віків, просвітництва, модернізму і постмодернізму, демонструються симптоми кризи монологічного авторства. Епоха художньої модальності є свідченням того, що береться під сумнів право не лише автора, а й самого мистецтва сприймати життя зі своєї специфічної точки зору. У зв'язку з цим стаття містить аналіз явища авторефлексивності (зокрема, засоби реалізації авторефлексивного наратора в художніх творах 20-го століття) і «аранжувальника» (термін Х'ю Кеннера).

Окремо висвітлюються транзитивні (перехідні) твори (наприклад, «Життя і opinii Трістама Шенді» Лоренса Стерна), в яких статус і функції наратора випереджують свій час і існують на межі ейдетичної епохи та епохи художньої модальності. Перспективи подальшого дослідження передбачають залучення концептуально-термінологічного апарату когнітивної наратології.

Ключові слова: епоха синкретизму, епоха ейдетичної поетики, епоха художньої модальності, авторефлексивність, аранжувальник, аукторальний, першоособовий та фігуральний наратор (терміни Ф.Штанцеля).

Беляков Александр. Инстанция нарратора как объект исторической поэтики. В статье рассматривается эволюция инстанции нарратора в русле трех стадий в истории поэтики: эпоха синкретизма, эпоха эйдетической поэтики и эпоха художественной модальности (С. Н. Бройтман).

Наиболее распространена в эйдетической поэтике аукторальная ситуация, при которой повествователь сохраняет дистанцию по отношению к изображаемому миру, являясь персонажем, не обнаруживает свое присутствие («я» или «мы»), рефлексирюя над событиями или давая метаповествовательные комментарии. Кроме того, эйдетическая поэтика знает первичную форму наррации, когда рассказчик принадлежит к миру изображенной им жизни и ведет повествование с точки зрения участника событий. Нейтральная или персональная ситуация, при которой повествователь стремится устранить себя из события рассказывания и сделать носителями точек зрения самих героев (терминология Ф.Штанцеля) характерна для эпохи поэтики художественной модальности.

На конкретных примерах художественной литературы периодов средних веков, просвещения, модернизма, постмодернизма демонстрируются симптомы кризиса монологического авторства: подвергается сомнению право не только автора, но и самого искусства видеть жизнь со своей специфической точки зрения. В связи с этим в статье анализируются явления авторефлексивного нарратора и «аранжировщика» (термин Хью Кеннера).

Ключевые слова: эпоха синкретизма, эпоха эйдетической поэтики, эпоха художественной модальности, авторефлексивность, аранжировщик, аукторальный, перволичный и фигуральный нарратор (терминология Ф. Штанцеля).