

THE TEXT – THE READER – THE LITERARY WRITING: A COGNITIVE AND NARRATOLOGICAL PARADIGM

Lidiia Matsevko-Bekerska

Prof. DSc, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,

e-mail: lmacevko@ukr.net, <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4626-5904>, Ukraine

Abstract. The article presents the study of some aspects in the specificity of the dialogue between the artistic text and the consciousness of the addressee. This issue is quite actively discussed in the modern literary criticism – both in theoretical approaches to analysis and in applied poetics studies. To a large extent, the methodological and terminological apparatus for examining the cognitive specificity of literature has been formed in classical narratological studies and refined in the latest developments. The article focuses on clarifying the essence of the reader as an important element of representing the consciousness, present in the artistic narrative. The specificity of the reader's presence is determined not only by its mediation status, but also by active participation in the creation and coexistence of several worlds: the intentional modus, its fiction embodiment, as well as the individual personal experience of their synthesis. Possible forms of the addressee's presence in the space of the literary world are modelled in accordance with narrative coordinates. The specificity of each form of reader's presence is determined by the conventional status, the narrative contour of the text, the objective intentional premises, as well as the ways of permeating into the artistic world, the ways of discovering the meaning, due to which the reading takes place as a holistic phenomenon. From the standpoint of cognitive narratology, every reader's projection has its own peculiarities that influence its place in the process of literary communication. It has been shown that the receptive significance of the literary work consists in the possibility of multiplying the meanings, implementation of the harmonious reader's understanding, corresponding to the original sense. With the increase of interval between the author and the reader, the content of the work is proportionally schematized, and with refinement of the scheme, every single interpretation acquires reliability.

Keywords: artistic world, narrative strategy, reception, interpretation, cognitive perspective.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.23856/3404>

Introduction

The modern tendencies in the deployment of theoretical and literary discourse greatly extend the horizons of narratology, in particular, in the poetological understanding of cognitive aspects in modelling the narrative strategies. The specific nature of the dialogue between the artistic text and consciousness is one of the major issues in literary criticism, expressed both in theoretical approaches to analysis and in applied poetics studies. To a large extent, the methodological and terminological apparatus has been formed in classical and recent researches of narratological discourse (W. Schmid, B. Vervaeck, L. Herman, L. Zunshine, U. Margolin, A. Palmer, M. Fludernik, T. Grebeniuk, R. Savchuk, O. Sobchuk, M. Tkachuk and others).

Specificity of a dialogue between an artistic text and consciousness of an addressee

Within the framework of representation and perception by the consciousness / consciousnesses present in the artistic narrative, one of the most important places belongs to the reader not only as an intermediary, but also as an active factor in the coexistence of several worlds: the intentional mode, its fictional embodiment, as well as the individual personal experience of their synthesis. The particular person, the reader, who turns the page by page in the book is one of the possible forms of the presence of the addressee in the space created by the literary world, modelled according to the narrative coordinates. In the contemporary literary studies, the researchers focus on three most expressive forms of the reader's projection onto the plane of the aesthetically represented text: «1) a real historical person, whom we restore based on historical documents of a certain age; 2) a reader we imagine, based on our knowledge of the social and historical situation of a certain era; 3) a reader whose role is programmed within the text» [*All quotations are hereinafter rendered in the author's own translation*] (Zubrytska, 2004). The specific nature of each form of the reader's presence is determined not only by the conventional status, not only by the narrative contour of the text, not only by the objective intentional premises, but also by the ways of permeating into the artistic world, the ways (or paths) to retrieve the sense, due to which the reading takes place as a phenomenon of socio-cultural, psychological and emotional dimension, etc. From the standpoint of cognitive narratology, every reader's projection has its own peculiarities that influence its place in the process of literary communication.

The first type of the reader is a part of the author's historicity; therefore, the intellectual and aesthetic dialogue takes place as much as possible in a person-centred manner, informatively and emotionally directly. The presence of consciousnesses – the creator of the text and its recipient – in the common cultural and historical environment creates an adequate receptive horizon, the semantic consistency of the work acquires a holistic perception – expressed in one (or common) ontological language. Text information in a related context produces a specific, particularly addressed denotative meaning. This kind of literary communication represents a model of personalized intercourse and allows for the least amount of imaginary and predictable elements. This receptive model is the least conflictual psychologically, because the reader, without being sympathetic to certain beliefs or preferences of the author, immediately understands the motivation of the represented problem, the way of developing the plot structure, and the peculiarities of personalization of the artistic world. At the same time, for the author there is no need to further comment on the vector of reading the literary work, to offer signs to identify the meaning of the text or subtext. The author's contemporary reader is more than the direct recipient of the ideological and aesthetic or narrative and factual paradigm of the text; in the development of the narrative structure, the author enters in a debate with his contemporaneity, first of all testing his own convictions, biases, ideas and guidelines, confirming or transforming the estimated stereotypes. The focus on the recipient's alleged response does not involve a personal contact, but the selection of the axiological, dominant element in the narrative space takes place almost synchronously. The Spirit (mood, experience, sensation) of the era creates a community if not of the world-view, then of the world-perception and world-experience, of certain parallels in the views on the same significant phenomena and situations.

With the passage of time, the second type of reader is formed, whose essence is conditioned by the knowledge of his belonging to a certain historical period. This type of

reader is characterized by hypothetical outlines; he is no longer personally interested in tolerating the author's identity and therefore remove dominant positions in a receptive dialogue. The artistic narrative becomes a grateful environment for searching for oneself, the cognitive process evokes the threading of questions not so much to the author, not to the intentions of the work, but to his own expectations from it. In fact, «many questions arise in connection with reading, and they all rely on the main problem – the ratio of freedom and coercion» (*Kompanion, 2001*). The time interval becomes determinant among other cognitive factors, it becomes the main criterion of reasoning about the place of the reader in the system of aesthetic conventions, as well as his right to the extent of the understanding of the text. The author's contemporary inherently has doubts about the perception and evaluation of a particular piece of work, since the next work may / is likely to appear as a response to these doubts. The synchronicity of the private life narratives of the author and the reader of the common historicity leads to a simulation of a real dialogue, which can be not only thought over but also voiced out. However, the reader of the second type («distant-in-time») no longer expects a personal answer to certain questions or doubts, as he do not seek the markers to facilitate or harmonize his receptive activity. The reader's presence changes the proportion: the reception becomes «more active than passive»; the reader has many more features of the «complex of individual reactions» rather than positioning themselves as a part of the «actualization of collective competence». Thus, the life of the literary work continues, and the deployment of aesthetically significant projection acquires a much larger receptive area. An apparent expansion of the reader's freedom is actively distancing the reader from the author's intention: the farther from the biographical author, the more shaded is the author's direction, and it therefore complicates the path to the original meaning of the work.

At the level of «the reader of the second type», the text becomes a fragment of the global polylogue: «to be implemented, the literary text requires the reader's imagination, which provides forms of correlates interaction, designed in the structure by the order of sentences» (*Zubrytska, 2001*). Perception occurs as a progressive layering of personal experiences, absorbing not only the first and the present reading of the work and the reaction to it, but also the entire continuum of the previously acquired and now multiplied meaning of this text. The present reader must know and interpret a large number of non-textual factors that influence both the integral perception of the work and the comprehension of its individual parts. The time perspective simulates the communicative horizon in a new way: «reading removes the synchronicity of the collective reception, it hierarchizes, structures and transforms it into a complex multi-stage process» (*Zubrytska, 2004*). Increasing the sense, acquired by the text, having the opportunity to add to one's own questions to the author many other derivatives from the external reception, the reader faces a set of ontological warnings about the original meaning, with respect to the author's intention or possible influences on the process of creating the text.

An analytical vision of the reading discourse as a process in the cognitive aspect should clarify the specificity of dialogical relationships between the sense and meaning of the work, between the author's right to be heard and the reader's responsibility to understand the author's intentional presence, as well as between the author's realized obligation to give up the space of the work for appropriation by the other – the reader, the recipient, the interpreter. According to M. Zubrytska, «the problem of mutual influence between the reader and the text is still not solved because of the obvious inability to comprehend theoretically and to outline all the intricacies and shades of receptive diversity with the help of conceptual and categorical terminology» (*Zubrytska, 2004*). Psychologically, the reading process is mosaic and complex,

individual and unique. The perception of the same work by the same reader may vary *ad hoc*, due to the presence, and then the comprehension of the whole complex of non-literary factors. Separate content layers of the text are manifested, gaining greater clarity at each subsequent contact of the reader with the literary writing. Hence, phenomenological peculiarities of reading rely on the nature of semantic element that acquires a modified receptive configuration.

The literary concepts, focused on the study of the reader's specifics in the process of aesthetic communication can be conventionally combined into two key issues: «the first problem is the world of artistic text and the «imaginary» or hypothetical reader that is outside the text [...] The second problem is the reader in the structure of the literary text, that is, the reader's presence as an artistic phenomenon, consisting in his ability to be the source, which organizes the artistic whole» (*Zubrytska, 2004*). According to A. Compagnon, these two aspects («the mode of potentiality» and «the mode of reality») in the comprehension of the reader's dialogue with the text are consistent with the fundamental approaches to literature: «in the formal and objective approach to literature, the main attention is paid to the literary work; in the mimetic approach – to the outside world, and eventually in the pragmatic approach – to the public, to the reader's audience» (*Kompanion, 2001*). These approaches, to varying degrees, embrace the reader in the space of an artistic work, but the attributive feature is an appeal to the significance of the literary text, around which the communicative and aesthetically meaningful space unfolds. Considering the work from a formal point of view, we will focus on the problem-specific, thematic and style parameters of its design, and therefore in the course of analysis, we will inevitably come to the discovery of those laws that exhaustively represent all aspects of the content, while trying to attract all the components into the system of the literary work's self-expression: from the author's hidden guideline, through the composition and character structure and up to the imaginary reading. Here, without calling the reader an object of interest, the position of literary studies logically approaches its reality and necessity. Returning the literary writing to its mimetic nature, the researcher will certainly face the problem – who is described and to whom this description is addressed. After all, if there is an accepted fact of reproduction or imitation in the literary work, one must also acknowledge that there is a corresponding reaction and an understanding of the fact that this described material can be recognized, differentiated and comprehended. Therefore, even the representation privilege does not eliminate from the discourse the need for the reader, even though his actual outlines lose clarity and certainty.

Perfect reading is a completely amorphous and elusive category, as is the case with the dialogue between psychologically unique entities. The fundamental position of understanding literature in general and every contact of the reader with the text in particular determines and simulates the strategy of perceiving all components of literary communication (intercourse). On the one hand, one can consider the ideal or perfect reading as such which surprisingly managed to assimilate with the author's experience, to incorporate into the world of emotions, impressions and thoughts, woven into the phenomenon of the text that the reception of the reader has identified with that of the author. In other words, the ideal reading is the unification of the horizons – creation and perception. On the other hand, after acknowledging the autonomy of the literary work and its self-sufficiency outside the personal world of the creator, one should expect from the ideal reading the new formatting of the artistic world, giving it a much wider range of meanings not only in relation to all predictions of the author, but also those about which the author did not guess. In this case, the reader manipulates the text and involuntarily becomes its author. It seems that there was no perfect dialogue, because

the reader occupies both positions – the addresser of the message and its addressee. As a matter of fact, A. Compagnon is right to argue that «there is never a book itself in front of us, but every time there is someone's consciousness who reacts to it and mixes with it – our own or another reader's consciousness. That is, the book does not have direct, clear access» (*Kompanion, 2001*).

The exclusiveness and full authority of the author's intention is questionable, as well as the requirements to provide a broader horizons to the reader's competence, increasing it in the rights to the meaning of the work. J.-P. Sartre actively developed his views on the reader's particular phenomenological status: «creative act is only an incomplete and abstract moment in the writing of a work [...] but the writing process also includes the process of reading as a dialectical unity, and these two interconnected acts require two separate agents» (*Sartre, 1997*). One way or another, but the process of reading (with identification of significant markers for a particular reader) is still a derivative of the writing process (with available ontological markers). The receptive history of literature, based on the intentional horizon, could represent immense interpretative models in which there would be a world much wider than the author could have guessed.

The emergence of a new work in the literary and aesthetic space is an event that requires a response. The quantitative dimension of the entry of a certain literary work in communicative opposition does not affect the deep essence of the artistic world: the reading of a work once or many times leaves a fixed set of elements, significant for its meaning. It is important that the reception is possible only as the next moment in the existence of a literary work after its writing, and that any emotional and intellectual dialogue is based on a really existing text. The readers treat an artistic writing, conditionally speaking, at their own discretion: they ask questions, build a fictional world in their imagination, and find answers to those numerous challenges that are already encountered during reading and which, by their very formulation, enrich the reader's life experience.

In accordance with R. Ingarden's concept, the structure of a literary work is a set of «plans»: «a) the plan for vocalization of words, as well as formations and types of sounding of the highest order; b) the plan for significant units: sentences and groups of sentences; c) the plan for schematic images, through which various objects are represented in the literary work; d) the plan for objects presented through purely intentional states, which are determined by the meaning of sentences that are part of the literary work» (*Zubrytska, 2001*). It is important that at each level the reader's presence is fixed – not personally, but as a predictable reception, as a substance, which is inseparable from the textual matter. For example, the «plan of sounding words» involves the deployment of dialogue in the language, understood by the author and the reader, that is, the phonetic component of the text programmes the consonance of the author's presentation with the receptive space. The lexical identity is just as important in case if the author's and the reader's equal rights are important for the communicative environment. Adequate understanding of the meaning, especially in the polysemy system, postulates an essential requirement for the reader: he should have the ability to produce chains of associative connections between unambiguous signified and their possible semantic projections. The next «plan» extends the dialogic space, when the ability to think metaphorically and symbolically adds to the need to understand words in the paradigm of their meanings. The flow of verbal matter is as far away as the reader can perceive. In the end, the ability to comprehend the intentional depth of the literary work involves the reader's possession of the author's historicity, the context of the work. Thus, it should be understood that the reader is on an equal footing with the author. An intentionally set content is based on

quite certain requirements to the reader. Both participants in the literary communication can be perceived as equally meaningful, and equally responsible for the meaning of the literary work.

If «a literary work is marked by an orderly sequence of its parts that make phrases, links between phrases, sections, and so on, then in this sequence the literary work acquires a special, quasi-time duration from the beginning to the end, as well as features of its composition» (*Zubrytska, 2001*), the integrity and completeness of the system of all components of the work is provided by the reader, who is ready for the corresponding aesthetic dialogue. Development of the plot or significant issues occurs in the temporal and spatial paradigm, typical for the literary world. Kaleidoscopic change in the images, transition from one time projection to the next one occurs primarily due to personalization of the world of the literary work in the reader's consciousness. In accordance with general guideline, «the sentences of statements expressed in the literary work» should be perceived, which «are not actual judgments, but only quasi judgments whose function consists in the fact that they give the depicted objects a single definite aspect of reality without putting on them a seal of reality» (*Zubrytska, 2001*). The time plane of the literary work is phenomenally realized in the reader's imagination, where events or different perceptions of one event are gradually overlapping. A holistic picture of the development of a phenomenon acquires semantic completeness in the artistic work, when all events, available in the text or transformations, attributed by the reader, are synchronized. Hence, the literary continuum, fictional in the author's design, moves into the reader's consciousness.

The literary work acquires a symbolic meaning, sprouting with additional meanings or their shades: «the product of verbal art, in contrast to its specifics, is a schematic work. This means that some of its plans, in particular the plans for presenting objects and the plan of images, include «places of under-representation» (*Zubrytska, 2001*). In fact, the greatest receptive value of the literary work is the possibility of multiplying the meanings, implementation of an individual reader's understanding, which is based entirely on the continuum of meaning outlined 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 refinement of the scheme, the reliability of each interpretation increases.

The literary work in the process of formation, as well as the development and implementation of artistic communication is directly correlated with the main ways of the reader's manifestation. The spreading of the text from one format to another allows one to pinpoint the aesthetic and ontological meaning of the work itself, to understand the correlation of the author's primacy with respect to the literary work, the work with respect to the reader or vice versa, and to track the patterns of the sense-forming format in the narrative structure of the work.

The beginning of aesthetic dialogue, which inevitably modifies the semantic consistency of the literary work, defines and coordinates the analytical paradigm of reception and interpretation, is the moment of the reader's individual approach to the text. If the occurrence of the work contributes to pre-omniscience of the author, then his new birth is due to the reader. According to M. Zubrytska, «the reader received an honourable invitation to the feast of a great creative game, where he had to pass all the trials, to master the textual disorder and separation of its elements and thereby reconstruct the mosaic textual integrity on the basis of individual signals and «traces» of organic unity» (*Zubrytska, 2001*). The emotional, intellectual, and psychological progress demonstrates quite distinct configurations of both the reader's play with the text and modelling the extraordinary rules of this game.

What is important is the phenomenon of the onset of the aesthetically significant «feast of the great creative game», the clarification of those key principles, through which the communicative experience gradually withdraws the category of the Other or, rather, the Stranger. Visual acquaintance with the text appeals to the emotional sphere of a human nature, causes certain, often involuntary, associations, and subsequently contributes to the creation of an impression. The effect of impression has a pronounced individualized character, it is equally dependent on the intellectual competence of the reader and his psychological readiness to plunge into the realm of another's senses. Openness to the knowledge of a new one, and especially to the comprehension of the inner essence of a stranger, is an ontological factor for the successful literary communication. Read carefully the text gradually assimilates the reader's imagination in the depicted or expressed space of the author's life (or emotional) experience, the peripetian component of the work is perceived as a part of the conditional real world, whose fictitiousness is comprehended, but reality is desirable, and therefore felt.

The positive onset of the reader's dialogue with the text indicates the existence of a certain coded scheme, to which even the appropriate key of understanding has been selected: «The word wants to be heard, to have a response and to respond again, and so *ad infinitum*. It enters into a dialogue that has no semantic termination» (Zubrytska, 2001). The first reduction of the distance between the sense of the literary work and its meanings takes place exactly as the first reading, since in this way the author and His reader find themselves in the common semantic field: «the natural unity of the impulse of writing, which is based on the need for plexus of active (creative) and passive (receptive) expression, indicates that both the writer and the reader – each in their own way – respond to one and the same call, call, inquiry or appeal of the soul. Literary communication, which enables the unity of the processes of writing and reading, is in fact reduced to the «question – response» model (Zubrytska, 2004). The approach of the reader to the text is a response to the author's challenge to be heard, to his questions: what? for whom? for what?

Indeed, «the birth of the text does not end with the phase shift «from the author to the text», which is characterized by a verbal expression of the author's» desire to say something «or the author's intention and their written fixation [...] each high-class literary text, like the mythological Phoenix, has a phenomenal ability to come to life repeatedly. The life of the text, which is due to the author's appearance, and its spreading in space and time – to the reader, can be metaphorically compared to the stellar sky, with countless number of unnamed and ready-to-their-discovery constellations that must record the multivariate birth of meanings during interaction with each reader in particular and the reader's audience in general» (Zubrytska, 2004). Each reader carries out the mission of the first reading in his own way, therefore not only a single work is a «nameless constellation», but the meaning of a certain text appears an indeterminate nebula in the semantic contours. With the personification of the artistic world, attribution of imaginary (divergent to the author's guideline) elements of meaning, the work acquires specifics – not a new one, but quite another one.

Reception and interpretation, appealing to logically motivated means, model the structure and its key reflection models. The first reading determines the ontological discourse of the work, sets boundary maxims of the estimated attitude. The conscious self-transference of one's own perception in the continuum of a literary work is called «the moment of accustoming» by M. Bakhtin: «The first moment of aesthetic activity is accustoming: I must experience – see and know – what he is experiencing, to become in his place, as if to merge with him [...] When I get used to the suffering of another, I experience them just like him, in

the category of the other» (*Bakhtin, 1979*). Therefore, the initial acquaintance with the literary work has a personal and psychological determination: from a prerequisite meaning, the reader approaches an unknown work.

The desire for emotional contact with the world of the text really transforms into the reader's dialogue, first of all with oneself. The matrix of images and verbal constructions primarily represents a mirror image of the reader's hope, and only with gradual development of the textual space, it postulates its own semantic paradigm more clearly: «the key principle of every process of reading, its dynamization and vitality is the principle of identifying the recipient's world with the world of text characters. In other words, penetration into the world of the text and settling in it is the ability of the reader to live in a virtual reality and experience it» (*Zubrytska, 2004*). On the one hand, the first reading is an indispensable attribute of literary communication, on the other, it is an exclusively selfishly motivated and subjective process. As R. Ingarden remarked, the «present» of the reader can have a very different «continuity» and is never a «point of time» (*Zubrytska, 2001*). The intellectual work of the reader requires sufficient effort to separate the vision of the self-in-text from the truth of the text itself, which is only approximately close to a true meaning.

It is difficult to determine with certainty where the duration of the first reading is completed: the next in quantitative terms, it can become the first in a new comprehension of the meaning of the work. Therefore, the «continuity» of the reader's perception is relative, we can rather state the permanent novelty of reading as a process: «at this moment of reading, the part of the work is constantly surrounded by a double horizon of concretization from: a) parts already read, which pass into the «past» of the literary work and b) parts, not yet read and unknown to this moment» (*Zubrytska, 2001*). Gradually, all parts of the literary work move in the past, but the function of the first reading is to cementize the meaning in the search for the recoding system of meaning, even if the author's intention is not exhaustively understood.

Another important sign of the first reading consists in synchronization, or at least in the creation of the illusion of synchronization, the development of artistic reality in the matrix of text and fiction reality in the reader's consciousness. There is a parallelism of images and associations, a dialogue is gradually shaped, which later acquires the outline of communicative discourse: emotional understanding helps to establish the intellectual, ideological and evaluative space of the literary work (the author) and the reader. Moreover, the originality of «the reader – the text» dialogue is its arbitrary time implementation: the process is not constant and gradual, all stops, initiated by the reader, increase the interdependence of the described artistic world with the one that becomes concretized in the reader's consciousness, because «even in the simplest short story, there is an opportunity of certain type of blocking, since no story can be retold in its fullness. It is these inevitable passes that stimulate the dynamism of the story. Therefore, when the reading process is interrupted and abandoned in uncertainty, it becomes possible to use our own abilities to establish connections that allow filling the lacunae left by the text itself» (*Zubrytska, 2001*). Thus, the first reading of a literary work is primarily a factor in the self-improvement of the reader – its remoteness from the author's guidance prompts and encourages to enter actively the intellectual game of the text, to simulate its semantic field, to contribute to the new life of the text, attempts to hear the voice of the text, hidden in the narrator's intonations.

It is difficult not to agree that «the paradox of the perception of literary texts consists primarily in the fact that artistic communication by its nature and essence is at the same time a complex social phenomenon and a deeply individualized, personally focused and intimately oriented process» (*Zubrytska, 2004*). The process of reception of the literary work, initiated

by the first reading, is a peculiar psychological projection of the reader's personality. It is directly determined by the non-literary context, as well as the level of cultural and aesthetic integrity of the person in the coordinate system, which formats the semantic essence of both modern literature, and the attitude and perception of the literature of the previous epoch (or cultural-historical epochs) that are different and distinctive from modernity. Therefore, there are grounds for analysing the receptive environment as the concentration of expected reactions and probable estimates of some metapersonal community as a way to realize the vision of literary discourse in its integrity and relevance in relation to the temporal, in the historical sense, section. That is, the level of individual penetration in the sense of a literary work is primarily determined by social factors, and only later it is necessary to note the way of the reader's independent competence.

Receptive communication is less selfish as compared to the first reading: if the approximation to the meaning is exclusively based on the empirical experience of the reader, and also on his ability to respond to the author's suggestion, then reception is based on a relatively axiological paradigm. Analytical thinking mostly focuses on available criteria and evaluations, differently verbalized, but necessarily synchronous with artistic and aesthetic communication. In fact, «artistic dimension is a text, whereas aesthetic dimension is the process of its perception, which is inconceivable without the subject of reception» (*Zubrytska, 2004*).

After exhausting a purely emotional contact, when the textual array is fully implemented, the moment for receptive comprehension comes – the text is filled with the meaning, which is so heterogeneous, insofar as unique and inimitable are the intrapersonal queries of each recipient. Semiotically encoded correlation of the real and fictional worlds in the process of penetration into semantic depth acquires various modifications; the permissible freedom of understanding has a considerable amount of space for second-guessing of meanings, the imaginary assignment of attributes, and, of course, recognition of the imagery of the literary work, individualized by its own stereotype.

Observations on permissible freedom seem to be of sufficient importance for the reception of the literary work, since the first reading is *a priori* devoid of any restrictions or requirements. The involuntary emergence of a figurative and conceptual contact between the text and the reader lies outside the various obligations of the tolerant recipient of literary communication: the suggestion of emotionally, intellectually or aesthetically valuable meaning frees the reader from responsibility to the historicity of the author and his own historicity for the level of established contact or the completeness of the transformed space. Instead, reception must necessarily design the evaluation criteria, taking into account the collective aesthetic experience and the temporal continuity of the literary work itself: «in the analysis of reception, the subject being examined is the effect on the individual or collective reader, as well as with respect to the text which is considered as an incentive» (*Kompanion, 2001*).

Receptive activity should be much more cautious than the first reading, although the result is also much more productive in terms of the meaning of the work. The reason is, first of all, the accumulation of knowledge about the text, the literary work, the author, as well as the whole complex of factors that formed certain circuits of literary communication. A feature of literary and artistic discourse is that «one text is potentially capable of several different implementations, and no reading can ever exhaust all potential opportunities, since each individual reader will fill the gaps in the text to his own liking, removing many other features [...] making the choice, the reader explicitly acknowledges the inexhaustibility of the text; at

the same time, it is precisely the inexhaustibility that prompts him to make his own choice» (*Zubrytska, 2001*). At the same time, one should reflect on the exhaustion of «gaps» or «lacunae». Exaggerating their plurality, we risk losing touch with the original meaning of the literary work, creating a fictitious reception of the fictional world. The receptive scheme should predict the probability or the presence of several readings of the text in terms of understanding its content and, in turn, offer the most optimal semantic paradigm. Possession of the context and knowledge of the author's historicity allows us to derive receptive attempts from numerous hypothetical representations of the literary work.

It is important that the next step after the first reading is synthetic in nature and more complex in its implementation, since it must take into account rather unexpected turns in the perception and understanding of the literary work: «the forms of the receptive process are not only articulation and verbalization but silence as well [...] 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 enhances the tension of the receptive load, recognizes the receptive background, determines the anomalies of the receptive landscape or outlines the topology of ineffability. Silence privileges *the homo legens*. It is the reader who «articulates» the silence of the text every time, and extracts from its depths something that the author's imagination did not even anticipate» (*Zubrytska, 2004*). The paradox of the literary dialogue is observed in the plane of the possibility of establishing an individual contact – generally speaking, it is always the voice of one person. During the real articulation of the author's speech, the verbalized portrait of the reader does not have any outline, the author's questions are completely rhetorical. Coding of meaning awaits understanding, but this expectation is approximate and desirable, and not obligatory. The reciprocal component of the process of reading a literary work is exclusively the voice of the reader. Therefore, the completeness of concentrating oneself in the matrix of the literary work, the depth of penetration into the content and the approach to the author's challenge or invitation to dialogue rests on the readership responsibility. The silence of one of interlocutors, in addition to waiting for a certain desired response, is important for formatting the openness of the semantic space: «having the ability to concentrate huge information on the «area» of a very short text, the artistic work has one more feature: it gives different readers different information – sufficiently for each understanding, it also gives the reader a language in which it is possible to assimilate the next portion of information when re-reading. It behaves like a living organism that is in direct contact with the reader and it teaches this reader» (*Lotman, 1970*). Thus, the author's silence turns into the polyphony of readers: while in a given ontological context, the reception is able to reach the range of the most reliable variants of the meanings of the literary work. The first reading can be the competition for approaching the intention, the reception should accumulate the author's intention as much as the author encourages and as much as the reader's historicity needs to appeal to the omniscience of meaning.

The reception of an artistic work is directly related to U. Eco's notion of «*the writing in motion*»: «if the polaroid lens is rotated slowly, the projected figure begins to consistently change its colours... By rotating the lens at will, the recipient actually cooperates in the creation of the aesthetic object, at least within the field of possibilities, which determines the range of colours and the tendency of the slides to be flexible» (*Zubrytska, 2001*). That is, if the author's voice at a certain time focuses on creating a dynamic and plastic artistic array, the reader's voice will be able to interpret adequately the silence of the creator. Thus, the receptive plane synchronizes the intentions as to the anchoring the meaning into a text with comprehension of this meaning, while leaving the author the right to hope for an

understanding of his plan, and for the reader – assigning the duty to listen attentively to all clearly present or concealed «voices»: the author, the context of writing the work, historicity in the perception of the literary work by various 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 split gradually into numerous shades of sound: «It is risky to assert that a metaphor or a poetic symbol, sound reality or plastic form is a more perfect instrument of cognition of reality than those offered by logic. [...] art *perceives* the world, it also *produces* the supplementation of the world, displaying its own laws and living their lives [...] in every century, the way of creating forms of art reflects a way of seeing the reality by the science and culture of the era through assimilation, metaphorization and actual solution to the concept of the image (italics of the author)» (*Zubrytska, 2001*). The dialogue through the literary work always goes beyond the strictly textual meaning – far beyond the horizons available at some point and thus causes the reader to expand the receptive capabilities.

The process of reading after the first acquaintance with the literary work undergoes a much more visible and significant pressure of the context, it requires not only the feeling-in and accustoming to the artistic world, but also the attraction of accessible intellectual and analytical tools for penetration into the content, hidden in the text. At this stage, it is extremely important to assimilate the original impression so harmoniously into a comprehensive understanding, so as not to lose the aesthetic appeal and uniqueness of the work, but also to reliably articulate its meaning. Hence, «hermeneutics is also, explicitly or implicitly, an understanding of oneself through the return to understanding of the other» (*Zubrytska, 2001*).

Conclusions

Thus, if the first reading is a way to search for a self-in-text, then the reception can be a search of the literary work-in-text. The ability to balance the author's challenges and the reader's needs, the ability to correctly project the silence of the author to the reader's voice and vice versa, the integrity of the contextual knowledge – we consider these and some other factors as the most important for establishing the optimal receptive system, to find the scheme of decoding the original meaning of the literary work, or as a way of transforming the text and the literary work with the active participation of the reader.

References

- Bakhtin, M. (1979). Estetyka slovesnoho tvorchestva. Moskva: Ysskustvo. [in Russian].*
Kompanion, A. (2001). Demon teoryy. Moskva: Yzdatelstvo Sabashnykovykh. [in Russian].
Lotman, Yu. (1970). Struktura khudozhestviennoho tieksta. Moskva: Ysskustvo. [in Russian].
Sartr, Zh.-P. (1997). Situatsyi. Antolohiia liyeraturno-esteticheskoi mysli. Moskva: Lodomir. [in Russian].
Zubrytska, M. (2004). Homo legens : Chytannia yak sotsiokulturnyi fenomen. Lviv: Litopys. [in Ukrainian].
Zubrytska, M. (Ed.). (2001). Slovo. Znak. Dyskurs: antolohiia svitovoi literaturno-krytychnoi dumky XX st. Lviv: Litopys. [in Ukrainian].