

THE PLUS FUNCTION OF NARRATIVE IN DIFFERENTIATING THE SEMANTIC  
LEVELS OF THE CHARACTERS, THE NARRATOR AND THE AUTHOR

GYULA KIRÁLY

Department for Russian Language and Literature

Eötvös University, Budapest

1. A work of art is most similar to the system of rules in logic. Just as a logical system is constituted of rules for usage, the literary work of art is also formed of a certain system of rules by the help of which we can think about our ontological existence according to the experience of past, present and future realities. In this context a literary work of art represents value in so far as it is a frame work of a system of rules for thinking in terms of realities.

At the same time this is the reason why systems of logic are different from a work of art as a system, that is to say logic as the science of thinking and the work of art as an artistic way of thinking are different. Since any kind of logic system is given once and for all and is suitable for reaching a certain level of human thinking. On the other hand a work of art is single in the sense that from the point of view of the given instance of reality and in accordance with it we can think over human existence in general only by the help of the given work of art as a system of rules.

This is due to the fact in art it is not merely truths that man wants to observe and learn as in science neither is it the

general connections of the notion of reality which should be taken as philosophical forms of truth but in *statu nascendi* the operation of these regularities of reality affecting and determining the life of man and society.

Therefore man's historical, social and particular existence is never present in art in its ontological forms but in its empirical forms as a concrete vehicle for these regularities. This is the reason for the peculiar sensitivity of art to the prevailing collective social ideological, political, moral ethical, aesthetical and cultural manifestations, and this fact accounts for the close connection of art with other forms of culture for its voluntary contribution to intellectual trends, styles of age and forms of cultivation. Being attracted by certain ideals and styles a particular age brings to the centre of attention such spheres of reality as open up a better view for us on the general forms of human existence. For these general forms manifest themselves in their true reality only by means of their cultivational forms, as they can be recorded more exactly in their everyday-historical realization.

In contrast to logic's absolute rules of usage, more exactly to the form-creating logical operations of thinking, literature as a special form of thinking can therefore arrange its own medium into a system only by the experienced reality; this makes and at the same time enables the consciousness of the current perceiver to set out and go along that very path which leads deepest into the tangle of reality perceptible in the given age. Distinct

from the rules and forms of logic established once and for all, here again and again we have to set up and create these peculiar ontologically seeming rules of the logic of reality at the expense of conforming to the given work of art as a rule of thinking - usage, since not truths but the regularities of man's ontological, historical, social reality, acting from the direction of concrete human existence, become eventually cognizable objects, tangible things. This is the very reason for the general phenomenon that an artist can go over the regularities of reality recognizable in his age usually by means of several works of art that is by more or less different approaches, systems of thinking, while in the creation of his life-work he relies on forerunners' and contemporaries' achievements in establishing rules and also on his own achievements just as much as on his (biographically) own real social experiences gained in periods between the writing of the works. Just for this very reason a work of art is not a system of signs (as for example language is), which would leave and push meaning (the 'discrete sequence') outside its domain. Neither is it merely a secondary system of signs for making models, which would remodel previously arranged material; if we can speak about a model at all we can do so only in terms of the model - like structure of the system of thinking. But all the time we have to keep in mind that the model in question is not a par excellence model of the world (we should always deny this concept of a model), but that concrete system of rules, which makes us think indirectly about human existence in a definite way.

We must not be deceived by the fact that this system of rules

presents fictitiously to us nothing but apparently ontological concrete things. This apparently ontological instance of concreteness is exactly the same as the scientist's example to illustrate a given regularity or rule. From this point of view a work of art is really a certain kind of sequence of illustrations; however not the illustration of reality but of the empirical regularity of reality. Therefore we have to do not with one single illustration of an example, although it is not completely strange in art as is shown by the genres of parable or generally of the animal story. But even in the case of a more complicated artistic model it is not the function of the model itself which comes to the fore, since it is also taken into account as a system of examples.

In this sense we can also speak about the symbolic meaning of every literary work of art. In each case when the model consisting of a more complicated system of examples is presented by the writer as a material of examples in its symbolic nature we have according to the programme to do with a mythologizing or symbolic work of art as well.

If we place the concept of "the work of art" at the fore, it will suggest the idea in connection with an artistic way of thinking, as if it conveyed, as will science and philosophy, meanings that can be grasped in forms of truth. It would cause us to forget that the main point is the record of the motion of general regularities of reality caught, seized, captured in a series of existential and intellectual circumstances appearing in their ontological state. Here we have to do with a system of rules which seems to be a suitable model for setting off such a train

of thoughts - and therefore for us just as well as for the creator is a work of art - by which we can put into practice for ourselves the laws of man's psychological, individual, social, historical and natural existence on a higher level compared to our situations experienced in life but which has an equivalent (so to say existentially).

Though the deviation from formal and dialectical logic is theoretical, it lies in the different form of the system of rules in both cases; which already indicates the difference between the subjects of logic and art, too: while on the one hand the question in the former is how thinking can grasp the laws of man's reality by the rules of logic that is in forms of truths, on the other hand in the latter it is how man can grasp this reality itself and its motion in forms of existence (in the artist's model). Therefore by the help of such a system of rules which restores and recreates the moving, present or past human reality so that its view set off a series of experiences and make us think, as do the real experiences of our existential and intellectual existence, which from time to time also set off our trains of thoughts which penetrate into the regularities of our social, individual and natural existence.

The fictitious-ontological level of a work of art is regarded by the phenomenologists as being as a teleological, by the formalists as a fabulous level and by the sociologists and folklorists as on the level of plot; we consider this fictitious ontological level as a kind of meaningful denotative level with a logic of authenticity, which, so to say, creates the illusion in us that we meet things

having taken place in real life, in other words the writer makes us view and take part in the existential and intellectual situation of the model, which situation, as we receive it into our existence and intellect, we could not make simultaneously our object of experience and observation even if we could in fact live through it in our ontological historical and biographical time and life.

The critic's interpretation as opposed to the reader's is usually mistaken in that it supposes this system of rules itself, this logic of authenticity to be the final end of the literary work of art. At the same time on the one hand it is true that the function of the narration in the succession of the epic work of art is really to support this very illusion; on the other hand it is also true, that this illusion is already as a semantic level in the sense that it contains the path to regularity of reality, too. But as soon as the critical interpretation fails to suppose the fictitious ontological level in this function-regularity, the reading of the work will or may be misunderstood; the system of rules will be degraded even at best into a modelling system which can be formulated by logic - that is to say it is on the level of truth - or at worst into a form of sociological, moral, ideological or ethical content.

The literary work of art - as a way of thinking - contrary to the art of sculpture and painting is not space originated as regards its ontological nature in so far as it perceives, compares with and relates to one another and to man, and presents the realities to be thought over primarily not as they appear

simultaneously in space - simultaneously for us as social, natural beings - but according to the succession, to the empirical forms of recurrence in time in our everyday life we leave behind in time and thus also make our own experience and perceive reality together with its regularities. Among other things modern art cultivates the events, situations more closely tied to everyday experience - either a more expanded motion in space is described, or the picture of one and the same place changed through time - because the regularity of the true is vindicated in the forms of recurrence; that is to say the process, tricks and roundabout way of cognition (the momentary intellectual and empirical, the true in the historical sense that is the true grasped from an aesthetic point of view) can be manifested in the teleological materiality in the same condition as man in his activity, his real existence, his substantial and active meeting and contact with reality can recognize and biographically in his fate recognizes it.

2. According to Tynyanov rhythm in poetic speech creates its sign level and semantics, as a poetic sequence of speech, by rendering the ordinary grammar and syntax of speech more difficult. In prose a similar function is performed not by rhythm, but by the semantically recurring sequences of rhyme, but they render more difficult and restructure not grammar and syntax, but the reception of immediate natural speech and its ontologic quality as direct associative semantics (dialogue, monologue, description, relation). In prose syntagmatic rhyme is the compass that helps the receiver make an order (in terms of genre) of the epic, the tragedy, the novel or the picture of morality in the associative material as

in an ontological meaning.

In the isolated examination of prose and epic only that can be seen, which Tynyanov also found in approaching prose from the point of view of poetry, that is to say speech in artistic prose remains in the same condition as it is in its ontological state, - although the primary point here is that the ontologic phenomenon denoted by the meaning of words and introduced by association remains such as it is in the existentially concrete reality. But the sequences of rhyme as the phenomena of a genre set a new order in that concreteness: the speech of the characters remains speech but their inner speech also conveys their being apart at a certain distance created by the genre, in other words that portion of their totality regarded as ontologic which is in accordance with the laws of existence and is aimed towards us. However, if we consider the phenomenon of genre not as a concrete and particular appearance of the epic phenomenon we can get really no further than Tynyanov: although we rightly deny the prosepoetic function of rhythm, we cannot get so far as to suppose that prose as a poetic structure conveys an aspect of epic genre, therefore we cannot realize the poetic phenomenon of prose which is the vehicle of the genre and thus we cannot realize its role in the accomplishment of epic speech either.

The epic "rhyme syntagmas" are the genre which creates syntagmas on the one hand of the associative (teleological) sequence on the other hand from the point of view of psychological logic, of the ontological sequence (owing to their internal regularity, which manifests itself in its denotative nature) and

as such they make up together the successivity of the epic sequence put in a perspective of genre and calling for a consideration in terms of genre.

Prose allows the meaning of the associative material to objectify itself retaining the grammar of words and speech, but also incorporating its ontological reality, the semantics (meta-semantics and syntax) expressed in the words of the characters, the narrator or the fictitious author by means of poetic form (confession, story form) and genre tendency built up from recurring rhyme syntagmas. The characteristic phenomenon of the genre, in the whole of the associative semantics regarded as existential, puts the semantics of reality into its right place and makes it objectively observable and even objectively observed.

For it becomes evident as regards the phenomenon of the genre too, that the epic as well creates a certain set of rules - a special set of rules - of human thinking. Therefore the grammar of the epic is the phenomenon of the genre and its lexicon the associative semantics; if we regard the epic as a kind of language, that language can convey reality in its ontological form about the regularities that affect human existence and about the influence of man upon the course of these regularities.

Why is the change-over possible and even necessary from poetic language to the language of prose from the time of the beginning of modern epic genres and why does this process seem unreversible? The supposition seems probable, that just as

rhythm, that is to say metre, drives speech in a definite semantic direction (into the direction of metaspeech, namely poetic speech), in the same way the rhyme syntagma (along psychological logic) drives prosaic speech and the external-internal movement in space and time (that is to say the associative semantic contents) as a meaning towards the genre's sequence of thoughts and thus into the direction of the epic as well.

At the same time it urges us to make a survey in terms of associative space and time and of a definite point of view (genre) concerning the relationship of man and the world. Just as rhythm (that is to say metre within it) and the logic of lyric experience in poetry, in prose rhyme syntagmas and psychological logic are the media and measures of the tendency of aesthetic judgement: this in the end leads epic thinking towards prosaic self expression.

In prose the associative sequence moves together with and is inseparable from the speech sequence and parts (e. g. of a character or the narrator) (with the "described" word) while this unity brings about a peculiar duality, the doubling of aspect. Therefore the dynamisation of the ontological sequence, that is to say the movement of the world and the characters (their psychological movement, too) is arranged by the epic genre. Only the closedness and oneness of this sequence (namely of the ontological sequence put into motion) can render unity and oneness to the sequence of prosaic speech.

Just as rhythm is a logic thought conveying or thought creating the element or predominant principle of form, the rhyme-syntagma and psychological logic are epic thought conveying or thought - creating elements;

the successive epic sequence of the ontological association (the progressive image of reality) is communicated through the genre-principle, and aspect creating channel of these two prose-poetic and at the same time predominantly epic elements.

The essential characteristic of a prosaic sequence is the unity (dominance) and closedness in terms of genre of the ontological (associative) sequence: closedness and unity together render the dynamism of prosaic speech (sequence) and the epic succession of the associative sequence, while at the same time they push into the background and check the dynamism of the autonomous grammatical material and syntactic structure of speech.

As distinct from poems the unity and closedness of the prosaic sequence do not affect the order of the syntactic-semantic relations and arrangement of speech (if they do, it is only to stylize the speech of characters or that of the narrator) but in essence this level retains the form it generally has in speech. What is regrouped, rearranged is the associative material in which this prosaic unity and closedness are created in line with the dominance of the epic genre and they in turn create the relations and succession of meaning according to the ontological rules of motion of this meaning.

In prose a decisive role is given to the set of relationships which is established between the prosaic sequence (rhyme syntagmas) and the epic sequence (psychological logic) and between the associative sequences and the sequences characteristic to the genre, between closedness and successive whole, a succession of prosaic

rhymes and the syntagmatic whole). In prose, therefore, not the process of speech is successive (not the monologues, dialogues, descriptions or relations of stories) but the meaning in a tentative cross-section of the forming aspect of genre.

Prose liberates words and speech from the arbitrariness of the speake but rebinds and drives meaning into channel, transforming it from the sphere of words and speech into the associative sphere whose complex dimensions of space and time presuppose the ability of the prosaic and the genre principle to make order. The forming of meaning in the ontological sequence is rendered difficult and even obstructed just by prose, but this associative material is arranged in unambiguous sequences by prose as well, more exactly: by the recurrence of prosaic-syntagmas, which at the same time unify, simplify and individualise the process of the forming of meaning through the channels of the genre tendency. Thus the whole of the work as an entity of ontological meaning marked by the associative material is absorbed in the tendency of the thought sequence of genre: in the artistic ideal of the social character of mankind conveyed in the concrete historical existence of man. Prosaic epic is capable of this function, because its prosaic rhyme syntagmas give ontological closedness also to the thought sequence - regarded as a purpose.

3. In poetic speech (verse) therefore a word and its artistic meaning are closely correlated in the meaningful groups of lyric self-expression, in the expression of lyric self and experience. But the behaviour of prosaic words in the epic medium does not show such

deviation compared to their behaviour in everyday communication and scientific information. The meaning of words in artistic prose is denotative but at the same time it shows a syntagmatic arrangement. So the meaning of a prosaic word, too, always functions in order to put forth the meaningful group, that is to say by the help of a whole system of meaningful denotations it builds up the meaning of a model as a meaning of a complicated set of signs but in such a way that the meanings of the denotative and syntagmatic levels become separable. While in lyric thinking the syntagma of words is in pretty close interrelation with their denotation and the meaningful whole, in epic thinking it detaches itself from both.

Epic may appear also in verse form but the basic forms of its evolution, accomplishment and differentiation of genre were born with the development of prosaic speech. It is connected first of all with the basically different relationship which is peculiar to the epic author's poetics of words and meaning as opposed to those of the lyric poet. The situation is that among the denotations of epic words already the word itself is present as a meaningful denotation as an existential word: the relationship of meanings is direct and they do not fuse into one other: the plus meaning is carried by codes of signs. By the way this is the reason why the epic genres evolved in prosaic word form and were differentiated through prosaic forms in both poetic forms of the epic, in story and in drama that is to say in the narrative or stage form of interpretation.

The words in lyric poetry denote a lyric self and experience

but not characters and situations in their self-realization evolving in space and time as the denotations of the words in epic do. The poetic self and the direct experience therefore separate in epic, the semantic plus of the meaningful whole levels the meaning of the words <sup>in prose</sup> (in epic) - just as it also divides the whole of the epic speech into parts (the parts of the characters, the narrator and the author), which have different functions in producing the semantic plus of meaning, and each of these parts is communicated through the meaningful texture and the semantic plus of the meaningful whole of different media: the parts of the characters through the media of words and action, the narrator's part through the media of intellectual information and value judgement on the level of words, (which is substituted for in the dramatic form of epic by complete personification and the composition), and the part of the author through the media of the words and denotations in epic. For the words of the characters remain existential words within the semantics of epic meaning even if they start decisively as an ideological word on the level of characters' parts and thus incorporate the external actions of the characters to a certain extent. Therefore Crime and Punishment or Hamlet, Tristram Shandy or any other "ideological" novel is existential in so far as the denotation of the characters' words plays a part in producing the semantic surplus of the meaningful whole through a transmission of existential meanings, and is not levelled syntagmatically on the horizon of characters. Just so the words of the narrator remain intellectual words (informative or ethical ideological, directly aesthetical, but not parexcellence aesthetical words), that is to

say remain on the denotative and not syntagmatic level of words, even if the author himself is the narrator.

As a matter of fact, the narrator's function is to differentiate the formal levels that is to say to create the network for the complicated transmission of sign and meaning. Thus, by his presence, even contrary to his own will and conscience he creates and communicates the only way of reference to reality, which is valid exclusively for the given work, thus making a narrative successivity in which the epically repeated rhyming elements combine into identifiable cognitive signs (character, event, situation), into characteristic features of reality and regularities.

Therefore the attitude of the narrator should be regarded as secondary to that of the author-creator not only because it communicates between signs and meaning, and between the proper level of form and the level of form of the content even if a level of form and content in itself is involved. Thus the narrator may be present as a described character in the epic situation or event, or he may be identified with the writer, but even in this case he cannot be substituted for the level distance characteristic to the epic; in other words in the same way as a narrative writer's immediacy cannot convey the whole of the meaning unlike lyric forms it cannot bridge and absorb through its words the set of values and epic function of the distance due to space and time.

4. The fundamental principle of artistic thinking in its general sense also corresponds to that of our present particular subject, narrative epic thinking, and can be conceived as follows: so that

a way of thinking can remain on its artistic and aesthetic level, the level of ontological reality has to be imitated throughout, since the precondition of the existence of this way of thinking is the creation of a level of artistic approach. And whenever it deviates from this principle this very way of thinking itself becomes problematic: either by degrading reality into mere illustration, a level of superficial phenomena, or by forcing it or one of its essential aspects of thinking into an abstract model of logic, thus invalidating the artistic way of thinking about reality. After all this makes the levels of description and expression respectively problematic, while at the same time it can be said of both levels that during the imitating of reality neither the intellectual nor the existential descriptive and expressive spheres and interests coincide with the final resource of the work, the text. The proportion and predominance of either of the forms of lyric confession or narrative epic in being based on either of the descriptive or expressive forms have no influence on the peculiarity of both ways of thinking which distinguishes both of them from everyday and scientific thinking and from the existential, ideological and theoretical ways of thinking as well.

A way of thinking in terms of lyric confession, which - to use a traditional term - operates dominantly with the expression does not place an ontological reality expressed in terms of space and time between the levels of the lyric author and lyric hero; and while the dramatic epic manifests the imitation of natural reality with the physical and psychological presence of the characters partly by

informative description. The same applies to the concrete forms and succession of space and time just as well as to the imitation of phenomena and objects. But while the author of dramatic epic in his own concreteness of space and time alienates and separates the characters from his author's existential and intellectual personality in the same way as the author of narrative epic does (and that is just where lies the difference of both forms from lyric confession), the dramatic form still does not create simultaneously with the described and self-expressing characters a consciousness or a character of intermediate intellectual horizon giving proof of a character's or author's relationship to reality - whereas narrative epic does exactly this; differing from the imitation in lyric confession in that the presence of the author (personal or fictitious) wedges the same concrete phenomena in space and time not only between his own personality and consciousness and the characters, situations, and events as the dramatist does, but in addition to all this he places the narrative description in the perspective of the model. In this way the author of narrative says twice as much as the lyric author and the author of dramatic epic, while he strictly distinguishes the words of the narrator from those of the characters and at the same time from his own sequence of thoughts. In the long run the author in his capacity as narrator, in order to perform the function of description, must back on transforming "the lack of the stage" so to say he has to render the story in a more economically way by abbreviating the successive concrete phenomena of space and time, due to the physical presence of characters; then he must extend the time he has saved in this way, either from the world of objects or the characters

and also expand space by multiplication or reduction in short, he must imitate and model the character - event - situation codes by means of association instead of imitating the real space and time of a drama on stage.

Imitation in drama can also expand space and time but not in terms of drama, only in the words of characters the excess of which however, always weakens the drama, that is to say reduces the possibilities of the stage as a way of artistic thinking, since extension is already a quality of associative-narrative epic. On the other hand in narrative epic it makes no practical difference whether the fictitiously real ontological state of space and time is imitated by the words of the narrator or by the words of the characters. That is the point where the possibility of the plus of narrative literature as opposed to the drama comes in; this is what narrative literature could and can even now utilize in its development and the evolution of its forms, it is this possible plus to which modern epic genres owe their prosperity. Beyond the distinctions of the attitudes of characters and the author, which is also done in drama, by introducing the function of description, the system of epic thinking has been extended on such an intermediate intellectual level as can be a suitable vehicle for the whole narrative texture of the work beyond the level of characters to that of the author; consequently an amazingly wide range could be produced due to the excess and variation of form now of description now of representation by dialogue, since both the author and the character in their capacity of narrator can perform the function of description as opposed to the function of dialogues and

description which on the other hand can produce important possibilities of variation in the semantics of the characters' level.

But to return to our fundamental question: the plus of narrative function being present either as a fictitious or a character's or author's narration or only as the medium of words (which can be called denotative), to describe and to begin to put into shape the imitated ontological reality in both cases it makes the artistic way of thinking infinitely sensitive, since its narrative-descriptive aspect can neither be excluded from nor identified with that of the author - that is to say with the aspect of the level of artistic thinking which is created by the model. And between these two levels almost innumerable levels of distance and forms can be imagined. The point here is that as opposed to the unity of the author's lyric self and the character's lyric self observable in lyric genres on the one hand, on the other hand the complete separation of the two in terms of form in drama narrative epic postulates an intermediate phenomenon which stands for a different level also in its quality. For this very reason its definition is decisive and from the point of view of epic narration it affects the substantial interpretation, and that is also why we regard it as a task of primary importance to establish the differences between the dramatic and the relating narrative epic as to different ways of thinking.

Albeit in a different way from the characters' relationship to reality the narrator still creates a character's phenomenon; the relationship to reality is on a more intellectual quality distinguishes the narrator - even if the narration is in first person - from a higher

level of thinking: from the writer's aesthetical relationship to reality, who is represented by the model of the work. For however much the narrative phenomenon may form an additional lyric attitude in the narration formed from the author's point of view, again and again it drops back to the intellectual level while capturing in its descriptivity that which regards as real the fictitious ontological reality.

The specific feature of epic thinking as distinguished from that of lyric thinking is that while it depicts, judges and models reality in fictitiously real ontological conditions (the characters) or in an immediate view (of the author), at the same time - contrary to the lyric attitude - it cannot create a level which is aesthetically coherent with either of them. Therefore the author of narrative epic is led to suppose himself on a third level of thinking, even if the author's narration is the most personal, particularly in that case. Since in such cases it is most difficult to control the author's subjectivity, that is to say to demonstrate the distance between the narrator's level and the aesthetic level. And we can really see that the author's narration is the least personal just when it is limited to the descriptive function, that is to say to produce observability, to make us imagine the ontological reality and to populate this reality and its opposite: the fact that the apperceiver is made conscious of the presence of the author's personality in the process of narration already indicates that plus function, which is performed besides description by the narrator's level in producing the aesthetic level of the way of thinking in art. The variation of more subjective or more objective

narrative forms shows a certain constancy in the process of historic development, though - if we regard the beginnings of artistic epic from the epic - we can see that it reproduces these two possibilities on various levels in terms of quality.

The meaning of the author-aesthetical relationship entails in the model that the lively ontological reality depicted in its immediate view in the narrator's description simultaneously appears in its ontological state (event, characters and situation) and in its immediate view, namely on a level nearer to the intellectual level of the characters or on a higher but still intellectual level. However this way of viewing - if existentially not so concrete and intensified and therefore in its intellectuality different also qualitatively from the existential view of the characters - shows an infinitely close connection with the intellectual (social, ideological) interests of current contemporaries. This coexistence and duality of the levels of ontological reality, which are lived through by the characters and at the same moment can be apperceived by another person from the narrator's perspective, enriches the experience of reality so much that it rivals the experience of reality in lyric confession, where - as we have seen - the lyric character and the author's self-experience are united all along. But since in the epic these two are held together not by a poetic but by an intellectual view (the narrator) therefore in the reader induces with both levels, the characters' experience and the intellectual observation, a third form of viewing and experience - epic lyricism - in which the characters living through reality and

the narrator viewing reality are built into the process of apperception as subjects of observation or attitudes.

The essence of epic thinking is the very fact that in the succession of the model's space and time the narrator and the characters alike open ever more doors through which we can get an insight into the author's way of thinking, that is to say share that way of thinking which is neither an everyday way of thinking of existential immediacy nor intellectual-theoretical or ideological, scientific or philosophical, logical or dialectic - but the way of thinking through the depiction of ontological forms of reality. This is the point where the author operating with the distance forms of the epic and the poet operating with the immediate forms of confession of the lyric meet again since they are common in that they make us think by depicting the ontological forms of reality and promise the experience of regularities of reality.

5. The art of the "word" is thinking in the forms of reality. The model of reality of the author thinking in terms of narrative form proves and manifests that neither the passions, emotions and thoughts springing from the existential experience of human reality nor theoretical thinking (logically or dialectically) examining reality can be sufficiently exhaustive forms of cognizance for man; since the former rather in concrete truth, while the latter rather in the everyday, practical coexistence of concrete and abstract truth or in the social, existential, moral concreteness of the forms of truth can only seize, define and represent this reality, the regular motion of reality. But also

into a genre's model: the characters, the events, the situation which are always interpreted by the narrator as a final form of reality, that is to say, as existence, will be degraded in the model's text into an intermediate level of form, its reference to reality will be influenced and controlled by the genre's model as a complicated system of signs. This relationship to reality of the text (model) remains beyond the narrator, because the conclusion of the event, the rounding off of the characters or the final picture of the situation puts an end to further possibilities of the narrative function. For this very reason epilogues and prologues in narrative epic generally have a certain ambivalence, they mean intermediate forms, in which the narrator "smuggles" the word to the writer or just the opposite the writer to the narrator (in the prologue).

The lyrical confession and the narrative epic are equal from the point of view that both of them refer to reality only as a closed whole (artistic system of thinking and rules), and the intermediate element in both of them is an experience and an event supposed to be real. Even if the subject of confession is an event or conversely the narrator's object in the model of narrative epic is a psychological series of experiences. The point where they deviate from each other, can already be seen in the difference between the epic and the lyric quality that is to say the current narrator in the narrative epic is led to view, to approach, space and time, in which an alien self's experience of reality comes into existence. This is what normally leads in the epic to the syntagmatic arrangement and separation on various levels of the denotative

word. The narrator is either excluded from the experience and space and time of the alien selves, or he appears as a character himself meanwhile having to connect the alien space and times from successive periods into a chain so as to support the continuity of the events. The difference between narrative time and the duration of the narration (the narrator's contact made conscious in the apperceive) is exactly the formal projection of this.

Therefore while the lyric model holds together its form and content, that is its system of codes and narrative denotativity, the narrative epic is led to separate just these two. What in dramatic epic is modelled by the space and time of the stage, not the merely successive evolution of the characters, but by their observable presence from the very beginning, in narrative epic is built up and placed in layers one upon the other in successive time by activating the denotative ability of the word and the memory of the reader, so that we are yet or already aware not of a modelled reality as in the case of lyric confession or drama after each act and even after scene but of a sequence of events in successive space and time, which captivates us more and more. But in this way we get farther and farther from the narrative horizon of the current narrator, and view the events more and more objectively so that we can not avoid checking and opposing the attitude of his interpretation. In other words we get closer and closer to the author's attitude, to the horizon of the author who considers reality through the whole of the model, and this simultaneously arouses the expectation in the reader of the conclusion of the events, and sets off its gradual growth over the events, which is just as gradual as its introduction was.

more generally: only artistic thinking can grasp the regular motion of human reality, showing it in its existential and intellectual totality. In comparison with the drama where reality's existential-intellectual totality is given only by the characters or with the lyric where it is in the togetherness of the author's and the character's view, that is to say it is given in its genre-specific one-sidedness, the plus of the narrative epic lies in that it can produce the triplicity of the existential-intellectual-aesthetical level in its differentiated quality and isolated view. But this in no way means that narrative epic is superior or perhaps inferior to other artistic forms of thinking.

Within the epic the main difference between narrative and dramatic epic does not lie in that the former produces a narrative time in addition to the model's time, of which the narrator is constantly conscious, while as regards the drama there is no person present who would somehow separate the space-and-time performed on the stage before the audience and built up from the characters' monologized or dialogized narration, and who so to say would apperceive the difference between the succession of the stage - time and the model - time. In this the difference between the narrative and the dramatic epic is expressed only from the point of view of form. The plus of the narration is due to the fact that it only postulates these two kinds of time alike, that is to say it treats the time of the plot as a final end in words other than the immediate bases of the message. And just this is done away with as form during the process of being arranged

at first into the model, more exactly into the narrator's story. The same applies to the dual dimension of the characters given by the narrator and by the model. The narrator's and the model's horizons are eventually separated in the apperceiver's consciousness when by the conclusion and closing of the work the writer and the narrator so to say exchange their positions: while at the beginning of the work the writer makes the reader accept the fiction of authenticity, and the narrator speaks about the story as if it were reality, now at the end the narrator already seems to be only the trustee of authenticity - even if it is the writer himself - while about real existence the author-writer confesses through the model.

The level of the "word" together with its whole denotative content therefore is the domain of the narrator and the characters in epic narration. The confessional, lyric or common forms and topos of the word do not belong to the forms of the model as in the forms of lyric confession. The current narrator in his communication with his reader never can and never wants to give the impression that he is producing an aesthetic value by what he tells and has realised a secondary modelling system, the artistic representation of reality, which is the substance of the lyric narrator and lyric character's coincidence in producing in the lyric phenomenon. The narrative epic deviates from the lyric in that it can involve such an object of observation, which we can not avoid viewing independently from its attitude and angle, - this is what is impossible in lyric confession. Because in narrative epic contrary even to lyric narration the aesthetic

experience comes about only if in its duality at the one pole, i. e. in the narrative competence, that shortest possible way which connects the forms of reality with the forms of aesthetic cognizance is fixed, and at the other pole the objectivity of the author's attitude, i. e. the distance, grows compared with the horizon of the character's and author's consciousness; the space and time segments which are as a matter of fact only conveyed by the narrator can be connected only in this way, which already indicates that the intellectual function of the narrative phenomenon in the epic is always subordinated to that of the artist, to the underlying principle of the genre.

6. Every epic narration therefore performs two functions: it presents a plot, characters and situations, drawing them gradually, and this is, of course, a primary condition so that it can convey the idea and the meta-information of the text's aesthetical whole. The narration itself as the production of a coherent system consisting of a relation of events, description, dialogues and monologues is a descriptive task with the immediate function to produce the concrete space-and-time of the literary work of art, in terms of the artistic "definition" of man's relationship to his environment. In this concrete reference narration operates with "events" from which on the one pole characters and on the other pole reality and the human situation crystallize. As regards the relationship of the narrator's attitude to the communicative competence of the narrative technique and to the information accumulated by it, it can be identical with or entirely different

from that of the author-writer. However, in both cases we have to take into account that characters, events and a situation as a matter of fact, are such fictitious concretes, which are not the immediate embodiments of the message but only the vehicles, trustees and codes of it, which in the narrative text as building elements of the model of reality are themselves phenomena having the value of signs, and the meaningful nature of which in the aesthetical sense - i. e. in reference to the whole model - need not necessarily be understood by the narrator.

The narrative epic has its architectonics just as well as the lyric confession has its rhythm, but its architectonics culminates in the principle of the genre's dominance, i. e. in the objectivity of the writer's invention, which is a dominant principle in certain periods of the narration also when the narrator subject is omniscient (objective) in Tolstoy's or Balzac's sense.

The underlying question of artistic narration can also be defined in terms of how the epic retains its poetic nature independently of whether the form of narration or dialogue in verse or prose language.

We saw that the decisive difference between the narrative and confessional forms can be grasped in the creator's relationship to the model i. e. in the difference of thinking in the model. According to that in the lyric confessional form the viewer-creator is not distinguished from the form and content of the information, i. e. he views at the same time himself and his relationship to reality as a lyric character's. Epic narration on the other hand views

alien persons, existences removed to a certain distance, and it can even make the reader assume an attitude to keep a distance from the action of the narration - and that is what can query the poetic quality of the alien existence and the intellectual narrator's words and speech - as a form.

We have to give an account to ourselves, that it is not folklore texts and not mythical texts either but literary texts where the author's final will, teleological presence must be taken into consideration on every level of the artist's model as a form of thinking: the principle that the text and context are unalterable, which absolutely distinguishes the model of belletristic thinking from that of folklore, just as the dual relationship of epic narration to the object of description, which is the other essential factor of the difference from myth, stands or falls with this.

The decisive difference from the point of view of narrative technique and form is that the character's or the narrator's semantic level (and the denotative connotational level which is the same) is removed into the distance in the description, in the artist's model always repeats or makes repeatable somehow for the receiver the path given on this teleological level i. e. in the described fiction, which the creator made according to that thought and ideal which is the final author's part, poetic sequence of thoughts and aesthetic meaning of the model.

This very plus semantic load beyond the semantics of the mere genre's model not only distinguishes the belletristic narrative art from folklore and myth but at the same time makes

the author's relationship to the so-called denotative level ambivalent: in this latter respect it lyrically becomes one with something very essential from all that which can be found on the one hand described, teleological, which we can call denotative and on the other hand is understood and made to be accepted only as reality on the ontological level, and denied and alien in its lyric nature. The underlying peculiarity of narrative artistic forms lies exactly in that starting from this epically removed, controlled and supervised object it can simultaneously produce the objective semantic plus of it. Owing to this very plus, the author's level, contrary to the "teleological" levels of folklore and myth, manifest the teleological level, which is produced by means of narrative operation, as adequately unalterable, inviolable and unique, in other words the author identifies himself with that capacity of the narrative form by the help of which he can guide the recipient and reader as well to the poetic sequence of thoughts, which capacity is present already on the lowest levels which picture immediately, i. e. are yet not artistic informational as a potential opportunity to become a poetic form.

The meaning and the meant in the narrative types of the artistic model are related to each other in such a way that not only the meant but also the meaning teleology, the meaning sequence of signs has the function of conveying the author's connotative thoughts without transmission. Only this fact can explain why the language of prose becomes prosaic in the artistic sense of the word in the narrative or dramatic narration not only when the writer himself is the par excellence narrator but also when the character or the writer-

narrator is the declared vehicle of the narrative technique.

At the same time the decisive question of the narration is the co-ordination of the word level and its immediate sequence of meanings and first of all the arrangement of the competence-network and hierarchy of the denotative sequence of meanings from the common point of view of the artistic sequence of thoughts and ideal and of the way leading to them. Without a narrator there is no narrative epic just as there is no artistic drama without taking into consideration the complementary-removing function of the stage. In the lyric the narration turns into itself or towards the object and does not convey this plus meaning, i. e. that of the way leading to them, just as folklore or myth do not do so either. In this sense all three are open. It is in the narrative epic that the narration gives dimension to the described in such a manner that the basic function of the narrator is to create and view simultaneously the objectivity of the words (their immediate denotative meanings). Though it is not only the characterlike or fictitious narrator - i. e. the narrator who himself is a depicted person or an informant distinguishable from the writer - who cannot span and apperceive the whole epic sequence of meanings but also the narrator of Tolstoy's or Balzac's type in the case of the writer's first person narration.

Folklore and myth texts do not make a distinction between the author's and the narrative competence which can be considered in the artistic narrative epic as the narrator's real own competence is first of all the narrative and teleological time (the time

of events) i. e. the total consciousness of the difference between the time of the narration and the time of the narrated object in the informational sense. Since from the point of view of the narration's attitude the behaviour of the time-and-space in the same as that of the characters, events, situations, i. e. the phenomena called basic codes. The narrator - either the writer or a character or a fictitious person - considers as a final word or end always the events, the characters, the situation i. e. he supposes this very human situation and this very event and these very characters to be real and existing. But the epic (syntagmatic) arrangement of the denotative level qualifies this attitude to be a possible and suitable informational (cognitive and picture creating) form, in which the adhesion and belonging of the poetic sequence of thoughts to (psychological, social, ideological, moral, intellectual, aesthetical etc.) forms of experience is expressed, through which, just for this very reason, contemporaries and successors - as readers - can and do continue in the same analyzing and generalizing way as the writer himself. In this sense the creation of the narrative function's competence in the model from the poetic point of view probably rivals the other poetic phenomena. Since giving the matter a closer inspection the creation of the narrator's horizon is the discovery of the way of inserting such a medium between the described and the meant (as a final meaning, sequence of thoughts), which can perform the same function by its presence as that which is performed for example by words in producing denotativity as a primary sequence of meanings.

Therefore one of the possible effects of artistic information

is that compared to the recipient's social, intellectual and psychological status not only the meaning is connoted differently but also the path that leads to it as an objective plus in author inventiveness. But this plus of the narrative function is known only in the artistic narration. And narrative function itself has a more important role in producing this plus than the other poetic functions and methods producing the teleological denotative level (space-time, time-space, psychological logic, recurring rhyme syntagma, closedness-openness). The choice of the technical and poetical qualities of the narrative function is explained in the poetic thought sequence itself, in the meaning of the model but it is to a considerable extent determined by the perceptible concreteness of "this is the way how we get to the sequence of thoughts in our everyday life". Among other things this is the reason why it is so difficult to investigate whether the author had found the only possible form of his poetic message; because where there are two such completely disparate semantic contents conveyed by a form, it is pretty hard even in thought to substitute something else for these parts, just because of the so manifold succession in the narrative structure. Among other things this is the reason why the Hegelian definition of form and content i. e. of the oneness of the model's sign and meaning, in other words the supposition that the aesthetic quality is a coincidence of the two, consequently the embezzlement of the ontological levels leading to the aesthetic quality, cannot be and is not satisfactory for analysis in terms of poetics, the theory or the history of literature, or of the work of art.

Artistic thinking as a way of thinking from time to time

differs from the philosophical, scientific and generally from the theoretical and this fact justifies and makes it necessary for us to be able to describe it as an independent form of thinking.