Yuliya TSYS

PhD student, Assistant Lecturer at the Department of Linguistics and Translation, Borys Hrinchenko Kyiv University, 13B Tymoshenko Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, 042012
ORCID: 0000-0003-0997-8438

PERSPECTIVE IN LITERATURE: MULTIDISCIPLINARY GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT

The article aims at outlining the main stages of interdisciplinary genesis of the perspective in various research paradigms. The study focuses on the features of perspective in various spheres and their subsequent impact on the development of the term «perspective» in linguistics. The term perspective originates in optics. The laws of perspective were formulated guided by the peculiarities of the visual perception of objects. The research of perspective gained practical significance in art and architecture where it was looked atas a means of realistic depiction of objects. In philosophy, perspective was seen as an important part of human knowledge and human perception of life in general. The phenomenological field of philosophy has studied perspective in close connection with ego and the living body that guide the individual's worldview. The sociological approach to the study of perspective considers the variability of perspective in relation to the interaction of the individual with the environment and other individuals, given the simultaneous presence of different perspectives. In psychology, perspective was studied depending on the assessment, judgment, attributions as well as on the level of empathy in the interaction of individuals. Perspective became the subject of linguistic research in the XIX century, initially in narratology and later in stylistics, semiotics, cognitive linguistics and discourse analysis. Research in philosophy, sociology and psychology has influenced the study of perspective in linguistics, especially in literature in the context of the character's interpretation of the world and situation, determining the perspective of characters based on their assessment of the situation, personal judgments or depending on the interaction with other characters.
Key words: perspective, point of view, angle of vision.

Юлія ЦИС

аспірант, викладач кафедри лінгвістики та перекладу, Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка, Інститут філології, вул. Тимошенко, 13Б, Київ, Україна, 04212
ORCID: 0000-0003-0997-8438

ГЕНЕЗА ТА РОЗВИТОК ТЕРМІНУ «ПЕРСПЕКТИВА»: МІЖДИСЦИПЛІНАРНИЙ ПІДХІД

Статтю присвячено з'ясуванню міждисциплінарної природи поняття «перспектива». Дослідження сфокусоване на особливостях наукового потрактування терміну «перспектива» в залежності від наукової парадигми і на розвитку розуміння терміну «перспектива» в лінгвістиці. Термін «перспектива» виник в оптиці. Закони перспективи були обґрунтовані керуючись особливостями зорового сприйняття об'єктів. Практичного значення перспектива набула в мистецтві та архітектурі, де використовувалась як засіб реалістичного зображення об'єктів. У філософії перспектива розглядалась як важлива частина людського знання та сприйняття людиною життя в цілому. Феноменологічний напрямок філософії вивчав перспективу в тісному зв'язку з поняттями «его» та «живого тіла», що керують баченням світу індивідом. Соціологічний підхід до вивчення перспективи полягав у розгляді її варіабельності в зв'язку з взаємодією індивіда з навколишнім середовищем та іншими індивідами, враховуючи одночасне перебування в різних перспективах. У психології перспектива вивчалась, базуючись на особливостях оцінки, судження, атрибуцій та також рівня емпатії під час взаємодії індивіда з іншими. Предметом лінгвістичних досліджень перспектива стала лише у XIX ст. в рамках наративного методу і в подаль-

шому постала у фокусі студій у царині стилістики, семіотики, когнітивної лінгвістики та дискурс-аналізу. На мовознавче потрактування перспективи безперечно вплинули дослідження в філософії, соціології та психології . Особливе місце наразі посідає вивчення перспективи в художніх творах у контексті трактування бачення світу та ситуації персонажем, виокремлення перспективи персонажів відповідно до їх оцінки ситуації, особистих суджень або рівня емпатії, а також зміни перспективи в залежності від взаємодії з іншими персонажами твору.

Ключові слова: *перспектива, точка зору, кут зору.*

Introduction. Perspective in literature is one of the tools to get a grasp of the inner nature of characters as well as the events around them. It might influence the perception of the whole text and its various components by its recipients . The interpretation of the plot and the inner world of characters may differ according to the chosen type of perspective. Furthermore, perspective in drama differs from prose. The development of the term «perspective» in different research paradigms influenced its understanding in linguistics, drama analysis in particular. Thus it is essential to look at its metamorphosis throughout time and fields.

The topicality of this research is determined by the lack of research of genesis and development of the term «perspective» and its implementation in diverse disciplines and consequentially in linguistics.

The aim of this research is to identify features of perspective in different fields of studies and their influence on perspective research in linguistics.

The basic material of research. Modern understanding of the term «perspective» is result from a considerable amount earlier works and approaches. Perspective was the topic of interest of scholars in various fields, such as optics, architecture, art, mathematics, philosophy, sociology, psychology, literary studies, linguistics and many others.

Etymologically, the term «perspective» comes from the Latin word «perspicio» – to see clearly, and was first used by the Greek mathematician Euclid in his *Optics* (Euclid, 1943). In this treatise on geometry of vision, Euclid postulates the basic laws of perspective stemmed from the vision theory, features of object perception through visual rays and optical observations.

Later on, the Roman architect Vitruvius offered a practical application of perspective in the theatrical scenery by the ancient Greek artist Agatarchus for theatrical performances of Aeschylus, the author of the classical tragedy. Vitruvius in his treatise *Ten Books on Architecture* points to the primacy of use of linear perspective by Agatharchus (Vitruvius, 1960). The scientific argumentation of perspective, in turn, according to Vitruvius, belongs to Anaxagoras, the ancient Greek philosopher and mathematician, whose treatises have not reached contemporaries.

In the Renaissance period, due to a new standard of realistic depiction of objects, perspective began to draw attention of artists. As follows, P. della Francesca in his treatise *On the Perspective of Painting* explains the vision of things in perspective and their reflection on the canvas depending on the angle of vision (Field, 1997).

L. da Vinci made a significant contribution to the study of perspective in painting by dividing it into three parts: the linear perspective, the perspective of color and the perspective of disappearance (da Vinci, 2005). The former later made it into a study of linear perspective and became an integral part of descriptive geometry.

In his turn, G. Monge, the founder of descriptive geometry, followed Renaissance artists in the study of perspective. In his treatise on *Descriptive Geometry* (Monge, 2014) the scholar designates a mathematically valid system of graphic images to solve practical engineering problems and uses perspective as a principle of depicting spatial figures on a plane.

Apart from hard sciences, perspective found its niche in the Humanities. In philosophy, the concept is regarded as one of the important characteristics of human knowledge and is considered to be a vital part of human life perception. In this line, G. Leibniz argues that the image of any object depends on the point of view (another term that goes side by side with «perspective») of the observer, bearing in mind that the same object can be represented differently without excluding the correspondence between the image and the object and between different images of one object. He also notes that every finite substance is the result of a special perspective from which God can view the universe, and every created substance is an emanation of God. Namely, God could see the world from a position of any point of view through the prism of a simple substance that represents that world with its own unique perspective (Leibniz, 1989).

In the XIX century, the concept of perspectivism appeared in philosophy as it was introduced by F. Nietzsche in *The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Music*. In it, Nietzsche argues that the tragedy in ancient Greece arose from the opposition of Apollonian and Dionysian principles opposed by the author in the tradition of perspectivism, i.e. different points of view (Nietzsche, 1994). Both concepts («perspective» and «the point of view») played an important role for the scholar as he formulated his doctrine of the will to power because they allowed him to explain the values of the world. According to F. Nietzsche, the eye sees everything from its angle of view, which is linked in the idea that any point of view claims to capture the visible object and thus has the will to power (Nietzsche, 1994 p. 5–6). Additionally, the philosopher emphasizes that along with one perspective, many other perspectives coexist in the sense that they are potential points of view. The point of view itself is the result of the action of plastic forces that focus the eye's attention on the selective perception of the world, which becomes dependent on the will. The concept of a thing, according to F. Nietzsche, is a form that contains a point of view on the world.

In his turn, the German philosopher E. Husserl, a representative of phenomenology, studies perspective in close connection with the concept of "ego", which governs the activities of the individual because it is the center of self-awareness. In *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*, he emphasizes the intersubjectivity of the world around as the world is centered around the central monad of the ego (Husserl, 1999). The concept of intersubjectivity is a complex of points of view that emerge from the interaction of a certain group of people. However, E. Husserl argues that the thing in the perception can be presented only inadequately, defectively and from one angle, and it is impossible to see the object at once from all sides and perspectives of its existence (Husserl, 1999, pp. 89–151). Consciousness is treated y E. Husserl through the prism of the self-perspective, i.e. the perspective of the first person, which is based on the individual experiences of the knowing subject. While considering the relationship between the act of consciousness and its intentional subject, the philosopher refers to the example of the perception of the cube by the subject of consciousness. Thus, he emphasizes that the perception of the cube is a complex and synthesized intention, which consists in the continuous variability of the phenomenon of the cube, which depends on the angle of view and the corresponding differences in perspective.

Additionally, M. Merleau-Ponty considers the perspective in terms of the phenomenology of the living body. In his *Phenomenology of Perception*, the philosopher defines the concept of perception as the relationship of subject and object of perception where the subject is the body, which is seen as the unity of subject and object, and therefore the unity of the world (Merleau-Ponty, 1995). M. Merleau-Ponty argues that the body of the subject is the point of view of the world as well as the fact that the subject chooses which side of the object they want to see (Merleau-Ponty, 1995 pp. 101–102). Therefore the object can be considered in perspective, which is a consequence physical location of the object in space. However, when the physical location of the subject is changed, the perception of the object and the prospect of its perception will change as well. In this way, the body determines the point of view or perspective of the object's perception.

T. Litt, a German philosopher and educator, studied perspective in terms of a socio-interactive approach (Litt, 1926). In particular, the scholar emphasizes that during the interaction with society an individual has the opportunity to look at himself from the point of view of others, which gives him a chance to know himself better. Due to T. Litt's special understanding of the concept of «meeting», in which he sees the process of becoming an individual by voluntarily recognizing experience of another individual as one that does not belong to him, the philosopher claims that the meeting reveals new facets of the individual's spirit as a result of interaction with others.

In sociology, perspective was first referred to by G. Mead who argued that objects differ from individuals because they are associated with different individual «perspectives» (Mead, 1934). According to G. Mead, the concept of perspective expresses the specificity of the subject's interactions with its environment. Furthermore, reality is a variety of possible perspectives, a plurality of various systems of interactions. Any subject can participate in many perspectives at the same time. G. Mead refers to the fact of simultaneous

participation in different perspectives as "sociality". As for the interpretation of interlocutor's intentions, G. Mead asserts that it might be done by means of role taking, which means accepting another person's point of view.

In a similar line, A. Schutz looked at perspective in terms of role taking during social interaction (Schutz, 1974). Hence, he states that the object that is perceived by two different people has dissimilar meaning for them caused by varied angles of vision and unique life experience. A. Schutz considers socialization to be based on reciprocity of perspectives. Mutual understanding in the interaction between interlocutors is achieved due to the fact that a person in interaction with another individual believes that the interlocutor imagines the world identically. Thus, A. Schutz claimed that only by trying on and living the role of somebody else can the person participate in a speech act with reciprocity of perspective taking.

In psychology, perspective was first studied by W. Blumenfeld . In his theory of the duality of perspective, which is based on I. Kant's ideas of judgment and evaluation, he distinguished horizontal and vertical perspectives (Blumenfeld, 1931). According to W. Blumenfeld, the horizontal perspective expresses the standard way of categorizing an object, while the vertical perspective is an evaluative judgment about the object. That is, his theory takes into account that fact that in judgments about people, objects and events, it is possible to identify both the point of view from which the object was categorized and the criterion by which the evaluative judgment was expressed. Due to this, W. Blumenfeld identifies such parameters of perspective as explicitness and implicitness, which, along with evaluation, are components of the theory of dual perspective.

In social psychology, J. Volkmann used the term «perspective» in the context of research of absolute judgments. In his experimental studies, he highlights the psychological and pedagogical aspect of perspective. According to J. Volkmann, one of the main educational goals is to create a better and broader perspective in the student's mind. The criterion that students have acquired the desired perspective is that they have learned how to solve problems in their relevant and diverse aspects (Volkmann, 1951, p. 274–276).

Following J. Volkmann, T. Ostrom, and H. Upshaw explored perspective in the study of judgement based on attitudes (Ostrom, Upshaw 1968). The scholars defined perspective as a series of alternatives with content that the individual takes into account when evaluating his attitude towards something based on a theory of variable perspective. The main claim of their study is that perspective is the mediator between the content of attitude and evaluation.

Continuing the experimental line in psychology, the perspective was also studied in line with the theory of attributions. During the experiment, E. Jones and R. Nisbett found that different spectators attribute different features of behavior to the same actors, and this difference in perception lies in different perspectives (Jones, Nisbett 1972, p. 83–88). They hypothesize that all the differences in psychological processes are reduced to a single difference, which is precisely the difference in interpretations of behavior by actors and spectators. Thus, observers tend to explain a person's behavior through the person's inner world, while the actors explain the behavior based on the factors of influence from the external situation and this is a variable perspective. Crucially, this line or argument will later lead to validating research of perspective in literature, drama in particular.

Temporal aspects of perspective were studied by K. Levin, who first used the term «time perspective» in *Field Theory of Social Science* (Levin, 1951). The psychologist defines the concept of time perspective as a cognitive projection of the motivational sphere of human being, which includes conscious plans, projects, aspirations, fears, claims related to the past, present and distant future. According to K. Levin, the time perspective is the currently existing integrity of the individual's vision of his psychological future and psychological past. He determined such features of the time perspective as a sense of speedy moving into future in adolescence, finding a balance between past and future in adulthood and optimism in senior age, which is one of the conditions in overcoming hardships in life.

Continuing the study of the time perspective, J. Nuttin insisted that the time perspective is related to a person's motivation and is a component of the intentionality of his behavior (Nuttin, 1984). The researcher links the term «time perspective» with such aspects of psychological time as time setting and time orientation and believes that this is what influences the regulation of behavior. Thus,

according to J. Nuttin, past and future events affect the behavior of the individual in the present to the extent that they are represented at the cognitive level of behavioral functioning.

In addition to the time perspective, the empathic perspective plays a significant role in influencing human behavior when interacting with others. The method developed by A. Mehrabian and N. Epstein uses a questionnaire to measure emotional empathy, which allows to identify the emotional reaction of the individual to the experience of the interlocutor (Mehrabian, Epstein 1972, pp. 528–532). This technique allowed to differentiate various aspects of the emotional channel of empathy in linguistics as well (van Peer, Chesnokova, 2019), i.e. the manifestation of emotional reaction in response to the interlocutor, as well as to investigate in detail the behavioral component and aspects that affect it.

Studying the empathic acceptance of perspective, T. Erle and S. Topolinski argue that it is inevitably described using spatial locatives, such as understanding the interlocutor's point of view (perspective) and includes a metaphorical combination of oneself with others (Erle, Topolinski, 2015). Thus, they conclude that individuals with a high level of empathic perspective better imagine possible different views on the same object.

Further studies of empathic perspective found a response in the theory of narrative empathy by S. Keen (Keen, 2006).

In linguistics the term «perspective» was used for the first time by H. James (James, 2010) who defined it as central mind or intellect of the literary work. He tended to narrate a story from the perspective of the protagonist whom he labels as a reflector, a center of consciousness through which the story is represented. Further linguistic research of perspective was mostly carried out in the fields of narratology, stylistics, semiotics, cognitive linguistics and discourse analysis, thus giving a clear niche to the research of the mechanisms of perspective realization in drama.

Conclusions and research perspectives. The studies of perspective in psychology, sociology and philosophy serve as the foundational background as well as the impetus to its research in linguistics. Philosophical studies help linguists understand the way a character of a literary work perceives the world and its components. In their turn, psychological studies of perspective provide better grasp of how perspective is manifested in the text through evaluation, including text evaluation by the readers (van Peer and Chesnokova, 2018), and empathy of the characters towards each other. Finally, sociological studies' benefit for linguistic research of perspective lies in understanding the ways of development and change of perspective depending on interaction of characters of a literary work. The studies in terms of perspective implementation in dramatic texts will be the focus of our further research.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА:

1. Лейбниц Г. В. Сочинения в четырех томах / пер. с франц. Я. М. Боровский. Москва : Мысль, 1989. Т. 4. 636 с.

2. Мерло-Понти М. Феноменология восприятия / пер. с франц. И. С. Вдовина. Санкт-Петербург, 1995. 213 с.

3. Blumenfeld W. Urteil und Beurteilung. Leipzig: Akad Verlag Win, 1931. 170 p.

4. da Vinci Leonardo, A Treatise on Painting / trans. from Italian J. F. Rigaud. New York, 2005. 208 p.

5. Chesnokova A., van Peer W., Reading and Rereading: Insights into Literary Evaluation. *Advanced education,* 2018. № 5. P. 39–46.

6. Erle T. M., Topolinski S. Spatial and Empathic Perspective-Taking Correlate on a Dispositional Level. *Social Cognition.* 2015. № 33 (3). P. 187–210.

7. Euclid Optics / trans. from Greek H. E. Barton. New Hampshire, 1943. 372 p.

8. Husserl E. Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology / trans. from French D. Cairns. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999. 160 p.

9. James H. The Art of Fiction / ed. W. Besant. Charleston: Nabu Press, 2010. 98 p.

10. Jones E. E., Nisbett R. E. The actor and the observer: divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior. Attribution: perceiving the causes of behavior / eds. E. E. Jones, D. Kanouse, H. H. Kelley, R. E. Nisbet, S. Valins, & B. Weiner. Morristown, 1972. P. 79–94.

11. Keen S. A Theory of Narrative Empathy. *Narrative.* 2006. № 16 (3). P. 208–236.

12. Lewin K. Field Theory of Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers / ed. D. Cartwright, New York : Harper & Brothers, 1951. P. 346.

13. Litt Th. Individuum und Gemeinschaft. Grundfragen der sozialen Theorie und Ethik. Leipzig : B. G. Teubner, 1926. 98 p.

14. Mead G. H. Mind, Self and Society / ed. Ch. W. Morris. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1934. 439 p.

15. Mehrabian A., Epstein N. A measure of emotional empathy. Journal of Personality, 1972. № 40. P. 525–543.

16. Monge G. An Elementary Treatise On Descriptive Geometry: With A Theory Of Shadows And Of Perspective / trans. from French J. F. Heather. Whitefish, 2014. 144 p.

17. Nietzsche F. The Birth of Tragedy: from the Spirit of Music / trans. from German S. Whiteside. London, 1994. 160 p.

18. Nuttin J. Motivation, Planning, and Action: A Relational Theory of Behavior Dynamics / ed. R. P. Lorion, Hove, 1984. P. 264.

19. Ostrom T. M., Upshaw H. S. Psychological perspective and attitude change. Psychological Foundations of Attitudes / eds. A. G. Greenwald, T. C. Brock & T. M. Ostrom. New York, 1968. P. 217–242.

20. Renaissance and Revolution: Humanists, Scholars, Craftsmen and Natural Philosophers in Early Modern Europe / eds. J. V. Field. London : Cambridge university press, 1997. 308 p.

21. Schütz A. Collected Papers I. The Problem of Social Reality / ed. H. L. van Breda. Springer : Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1974. 416 p.

22. van Peer W., Chesnokova A. What Literature Does to Our Emotions, And How Do We Know? Empirical Studies Will Tell. *Synopsis Text Context Media,* 2019. № 25. P. 1–10.

23. Vitruvius The Ten Books on Architecture / trans. from Latin M. H. Morgan. New York, 1960. 331 p.

24. Volkmann J. Scales of judgement and their implications for social psychology / eds. J. H. Rohrer, M. Sherif. New York, 1951. P. 273–294.

REFERENCES:

1. Leibniz, H. (1989). Sochineniya v chetyrekh tomakh [Essays in four volumes]. (Ya. Borovsky, Trans). Moscow : Mysl. [in Russian]

2. Merleau-Ponty, M. (1995). Fenomenolohiya vospriyatiya [Phenomenology of perception]. (I. Vdovina, Trans). Sankt-Peterburh : Nauka. [in Russian]

3. Blumenfeld, W. (1931). *Urteil und Beurteilung*. Akad Verlag Win.

4. Chesnokova, Anna & van Peer, Willie. (2018). Reading and Rereading: Insights into Literary Evaluation. *Advanced Education.* 5, 39–46. URL: doi/10.20535/2410-8286.125730

5. da Vinci, L. (2005) A Treatise on Painting (J.F. Rigaud, Trans.). New York, Dover Publications.

6. Erle, T. M., & Topolinski, S. (2015). Spatial and empathic perspective-taking correlate on a dispositional level. Social Cognition, 33 (3), 187–210. URL: doi.org/10.1521/soco.2015.33.3.187

7. Euclid (1943). Optics (H. E. Barton, Trans.) New Hampshire, Optica Publishing Group.

8. Field, J. V., & James, J. L. (Eds.). (1997) *Renaissance and Revolution: Humanists, Scholars, Craftsmen and Natural Philosophers in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge university press.

9. Husserl, E. (1999). Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology (D. Cairns, Trans.). London : Kluwer Academic Publishers.

10. James, H. (2010). *The Art of Fiction* (W. Besant, Ed.). Nabu Press.

11. Jones, E. E., & Nisbett, R. E. (1972). The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior. In E. E. Jones, D. Kanouse, H. H. Kelley, R. E. Nisbett, S. Valins, & B. Weiner (Eds.), Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior. Morristown, NJ : General Learning Press.

12. Keen, S. (2006). A Theory of Narrative Empathy. *Narrative,* № 16 (3), P. 208–236.

13. Lewin, K. (1951). *Field Theory of Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers* (D. Cartwright, Ed.). Harper & Brothers.

14. Litt, Th. (1926). *Individuum und Gemeinschaft. Grundfragen der sozialen Theorie und Ethik*. B. G. Teubner.

15. Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society* (Ch. W. Morris, Ed.). University of Chicago Press.

16. Mehrabian A., & Epstein N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. *Journal of Personality*, 40 (4), 525–543. URL: doi/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1972.tb00078.x

17. Monge, G. (2014). An Elementary Treatise On Descriptive Geometry: With A Theory Of Shadows And Of Perspective (J. F. Heather, Trans.). Whitefish, Literary Licensing, LLC.

18. Nietzsche, F. (1994). The Birth of Tragedy: from the Spirit of Music (S. Whiteside Trans.). London, Penguin Classics.

19. Nuttin, J. (1984). *Motivation, Planning, and Action: A Relational Theory of Behavior Dynamics* (R. P. Lorion, Ed.). Psychology Press.

20. Ostrom, T. M. and Upshaw, H. S. (1968) Psychological perspective and attitude change. In A. G. Greenwald, T. C. Brock & T. M. Ostrom (Eds.), Psychological Foundations of Attitudes. New York : Academic Press.

21. Schütz, A. (1974). *Collected Papers I. The Problem of Social Reality* (H. L. van Breda, Ed.). Springer : Kluwer Academic Publishers.

22. van Peer, Willie & Chesnokova, Anna. (2019). What Literature Does to Our Emotions, And How Do We Know? *Empirical Studies* Will Tell. 25, 1–10. URL: doi/10.28925/2311-259x.2019.1.1

23. Vitruvius (1960). The Ten Books on Architecture (M. H. Morgan, Trans.). New York, Dover Publications.

24. Volkmann, J. (1951). Scales of judgment and their implications for social psychology. In J. H. Rohrer & M. Sherif (Eds.), Social psychology at the crossroads. New York : Harper & Brothers.