FROM THE DAWN OF NARRATIVE STUDIES TO THE 'NARRATIVE TURN'

Iegorova Anna Viktorivna

PhD in Philology,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Philology and Translation
National Transport University
1, Omelyanovycha-Pavlenka str., Kyiv, Ukraine

This article outlines the theoretical and methodological background underlying contemporary understanding of the concept of narrative in science, which requires a deep and comprehensive theoretical analysis of related literature. It brings in the limelight the evolution of the concept of narrative. Once an object of interest and research exclusively in literary studies, narrative as a research object has travelled a long epistemological way to finally become one of the central research domains in most modern humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences such as history, historiography, anthropology, sociology, philosophy, cultural studies, theology, law, medicine, psychotherapy and, thus, has become the domain of truly interdisciplinary research. This shift, called "Narrative turn" was triggered by the understanding that the functioning of various forms of knowledge (personal, universal, socially or institutionally driven) can only be interpreted through their narrative nature. Therefore, it has been necessary to trace the change of the concept of narrative in parallel to the major shifts both in linguistic as well as in philosophical scientific paradigms, reaching far beyond conventional strictly philological science. While within Structuralist paradigm research was centred exclusively on formal and content structure of a narrative, seeking to reveal universal narrative models and universal paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations between elements, Pragmatic paradigm focused its attention on features of narratives to a communicative situation, socio-cultural factors influencing narrative production and comprehension, pragmatic functions, conditions and purposes of narration. In the Cognitive-Discursive paradigm, the narrative started to be viewed as a means, an instrument and a form of ordering subjective experience and situational models of speakers. Finally, the latter understanding has triggered the interest in narrative analysis within philosophy, psychology and sociology, resulting in truly interdisciplinary research.
Key words: narrative, narrative turn, linguistic paradigms, postmodern philosophy.

Problem statement. Traditional narrative studies originate from the ideas of Aristotle in his "Poetics" and deal with novels, short stories, fairy-tales and other literary genres. Such studies were rather intuitive and focused primarily on relationships between fiction and reality, as well as on the structure of the plot, characters, spatio-temporal parameters, the narrator's point of view, and symbols and styles furnishing literary storytelling. To the extent that the relationship between narrative structures and their verbal expression was not described, this approach was quite unsystematic. There was also no definition of narrative, and the fact that, for example, a novel is a narrative was simply taken for granted [23, 6-7]. In addition, narratives arising in everyday communication, narratives-in-interaction were not taken into account whatsoever. However, with the onset of deep and comprehensive philological research, the situation has been changing considerably and rapidly, and finally, narrative research has gained unprecedented interest in academia. Interestingly, the narrative has travelled a long way from being an object of scrupulous research, first in literary, and later in linguistic studies, to becoming a key methodological instrument in various aspects of multidisciplinary studies in humanities.

Taking this into account, the purpose of this article is to outline the theoretical and methodological background underlying modern understanding of the concept of narrative in science, which requires a deep and comprehensive theoretical analysis of related literature. This aim presupposes the necessity to trace the change of this concept parallel to the major shifts both in linguistic and philosophical scientific paradigms, reaching far beyond conventional strictly philological science.

The analysis. The second half of the twentieth century has witnessed the advent of Structuralism, an intellectual movement and paradigm, originating in the work of the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure. The ideas of Structuralism gave rise to a change of approaches applied in human sciences, including literary studies, where the interest in narratives gradually transformed into a separate branch – Narratology. The attention of researchers was centred on the formal and content structure of a narrative. Narratology proposed a method of text reduction to the set of its structural units, such as spheres of action and functions, and explained certain correlations between these units.

New ideas were developed by the Formalist school (Eichenbaum, Shklovskiy, Tomaszewskiy), who were the first to propose the dichotomy fabula vs. sjuzhet, which became the starting point for the development of global narrative models by R. Barthes in terms of récit vs. narration, T. Todorov in terms of historie vs. discours, and G. Genette in terms of récit vs. histoire vs. narration [9, 12-13; 22, 175-189]. Broadly speaking, these authors were seeking to distinguish between categories that related to what is told (the plot of a story) and how it is told (the ways the elements of the plot are arranged).

The structural study of classical narrative, which led to a revolution in the field, was made in 1928 by V. Propp in his fundamental work "Morphology of the Folktale" [19]. Propp offered the idea that the text of a fairy tale is built according to an invariant structure and consists of a limited set of functions arranged in some universal sequence, where 'function' is defined as "the act of a character defined from the point of view of its significance for the course of the action" [19, 21]. Propp identified a total of 31 functions, among which absentation, interdiction, violation of interdiction, reconnaissance, trickery, etc. Having grouped these functions in 'cycles of actions', Propp concluded that all characters in any fairy-tale could be resolved into broader character functions such as a villain, dispatcher, helper, donor, hero, etc. [19].

These first structural and functional approaches were further developed in the works of French Structuralists. In particular, in 1950 E. Souriau published "Les Deux Cent Mille Situations dramatiques" (Two hundred thousand dramatic situations), in which his analysis of European drama resulted in distinguishing six functions and five methods of their combinations which provide a total of 210,141 various dramatic situations. Functions in Souriau's theory (which are designated by proponent zodiac signs), e.g. 'strength', 'will' and 'desire', constitute the main driving force of action. The dramatic situation is understood as a specific set of functions in their interaction (as cited in 6, 34].

The next step towards developing narrative theory was made by A. Greimas in 1966. This French scholar developed the actantial model, in which an actant is understood as a class of concepts, combining different roles in one function and related to other actants on three axis: 'desire', 'power' and 'knowledge' [12].

Along with literary studies of narrative within the Structuralist movement, new theories were developed in the field of anthropology, especially linguistic anthropology. The prominent anthropologist C. Lévi-Strauss in his paper "The Structural Study of Myth" (1955) analyzed myths as a system of signs in their paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations drawing upon an approach similar to Saussure's in linguistics. Lévi-Strauss sought to explain the fundamental cognitive categories of the human mind through myths. These categories are formed by a series of binary oppositions called 'mythemes': nature and society, man and woman, left and right, etc. All these dichotomously organized mythemes make up a structure, the 'armature' of myth. According to Lévi-Strauss, myths are variations of some fundamental themes, which can be reduced to certain universal paradigmatic structures [13]. Even though the syntagmatic relations and the content in a myth (story/narrative) may vary, the paradigmatic relations in any story remain similar across cultures [13]. This suggests the existence of universal mental operations of classification and organization of reality, which underlie all narratives, artificial or natural, spontaneously appearing in everyday talk.

With the change of linguistic paradigm from Structuralism to Pragmatics, the interest in narrative studies made another shift. While the structuralists took into account only artificial narratives (like myths, fairy tales, novels, etc.), seeking to determine systemic relations that underlie narrative (such as universal structure, roles of author and reader, actions, actors and their functions in the construction and development of the narrative), Pragmatics finally brought into spotlight stories told in everyday communication. Understood as the product of the communicative activity, natural oral narratives finally became the objects of interest of narrative research. Therefore, researchers focused their attention on the problems of defining features of narratives to a communicative situation, specific socio-cultural factors that influence production and comprehension of the stories, pragmatic functions, conditions and purposes of generating stories.

Cognitive-discursive paradigm that seeks to explain the relationship between the operations of thinking and consciousness and their reflection in speech and discursive structures has influenced the vision of narrative as a complex discursive phenomenon that can demonstrate the features of structuring knowledge about certain events in the real world according to cognitive mechanisms and patterns/models of production, comprehension and reproduction. The narrative started to be viewed as a means, an instrument and a form of ordering subjective experience and situational models of speakers [cf. 5; 7]. The narrative mode/way of categorizing reality underlies the creation of the speaker's model of the situation and their identity in this situation, based on a combination of

subjective experiences with the dominant models of conceptualizing such situations, which in their turn are predetermined by dominant discourses, socio-cultural scenarios, everyday and institutional ideology and other factors.

According to Brokmeier & Harre, the narrative became "not just a new empirical subject of research [...] but a new theoretical approach, a new genre of philosophy of science", and the narrative turn "is to be seen as part of larger tectonic shifts in our cultural architecture of knowledge following the crisis of the modernist episteme" [3, 39]. Therefore, it seems necessary to outline major changes in the philosophy of science in the late twentieth century, which led to and resulted in what is known as Narrative Turn.

According to the Brokmeier & Harre, "in most disciplines the positivist philosophy that led to serious misunderstandings of science has been sharply criticized, opening up new horizons for interpretive investigations which focus on social, discursive and cultural forms of life, as opposed to a futile search for universal laws of human behaviour" [3, 39]. Science gave up the dream of comprehensive knowledge and accepted the idea of instability, exclusion of determinism and recognition of temporality, which created a new attitude to the world. These factors gave way to a high degree of scientific interpretative activity. The interest of researchers now moved from scientific analysis of objective phenomena to the study of subjectivity. An individual, an active social subject, being the holder of cultural knowledge and certain personal experience, who is subjectively recreating and generating meanings through texts, becomes a link to new scientific findings. As Lyotard notes, "knowledge finds its validity not within itself, not in a subject that develops by actualizing its learning possibilities, but in a practical subject humanity" [14, 35].

Although the philosophy of the twentieth century was mainly concerned with language and studied how language relates to the world and what ""leading" sciences and technologies have had to do with language" [14, 3], it was the postmodern philosophy that produced a significant impact on the modern vision of narrative and made it possible to expand the range of narrative problems. The analysis of language functioning started to be employed to study patterns of existence not only of individual actors (speakers), but also the conformity with natural laws of existence of the whole culture, which is deeply infiltrated in various discourses.

Postmodernism spawned the interpretation of consciousness as a set of texts and has acknowledged the possibility of multiple interpretations of each text beginning to examine society and culture as a unity of decentered structures. As part of this philosophy, the fundamental impossibility of unambiguous interpretation of text/discourse is made prominent, as any text is now understood as being based on a large array of unconscious knowledge and is a part of a larger whole, the context, the limits of which are impossible to determine accurately and completely.

This gave rise to the problem of subjective perception of the world by every individual, and, therefore, to reality interpretations. As noted by Bakhtin, "the the problem of the multiplicity of reality reflected in the text, the authors creating the text, the performers of the text (if they exist) and finally the listeners or readers who recreate and in so doing renew the text – participate equally in the creation of the represented world of the text" [1, 253]. They add their mostly subjective interpretation, based upon individual experience and the broader system of cultural codes and regulations.

It should also be noted that the role of the scientist has changed as well. Previously scientists were considered to be objective observers, but now they have become part of the social and linguistic construction of everyday life. Given that any scientist is a member of a particular society, their interpretative procedures are only partially considered to be strictly logical and scientific but rather based on the common knowledge shared with other members of the society they belong to. All these facts made it possible for Postmodernism to assert the inevitability of multiple and endless interpretive processes and epistemological priority of common, ordinary knowledge, the major form of which is narrative.

Narratives, as Lyotard argues, "determine criteria of competence and/or illustrate how they are to be applied. They thus define what has the right to be said and done in the culture in question, and since they are themselves a part of that culture, they are legitimated by the simple fact that they do what they do" [14, 23]. The narrative is the key to identifying and revealing specific ways of world conceptualizing and individual representation of this world by a narrator.

The understanding that functioning of various forms of knowledge (personal, universal, socially or institutionally driven) can only be interpreted through their narrative nature resulted in narrative appearing to be in the spotlight not only of Narratology, but also humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences such as history, historiography, anthropology, sociology, philosophy, cultural studies, theology, law, medicine and psychotherapy [8, 518].

Modern philosophy considers narratives as mechanisms of human existence organization, as a means of forming, understanding and representation

of the narrator's identity. But, according to Brockmeier & Harre, the concept of narrative is too often used as if it is only a word to describe a specific ontology [3, 47-49]. However, this term should be used rather as an expression of models of organizing and ordering our experience, which makes it meaningful in a variety of communicative situations; as a condensed set of 'rules' that include what is conformed and successfully operating in the framework of specific cultural canon. Thus, narratives are integrated into general cultural and personal experience, which results in the stories that we tell, or the "stories that we live by" [16]. But it should be noted that language users do not always operate with narratives that are imposed by culture; their stories can both support and protest against the dominant social practices, which is also a manifestation of identity [8; 20]. For example, Frey identified the following narrative structures of the human identity: 'comedy' (negates social norms and conventions that inhibit desire), 'romance' (idealized past and tradition), 'tragedy' (showing the defeat of the hero and his expulsion from the society), 'satire' (takes issue with previous versions of narrative structures when they cannot cope with the task of building a life of meaning) (as cited in 2, 131).

The postmodern paradigm argues that the speaker's image of the 'self' and the possibility of understanding the 'self' and their lives is inextricably linked to the textual and dialogical interpretation of the world. This idea has influenced psychology and psychoanalysis, where research and analysis are centred on personal narratives. Narrative psychology argues that human identity is reflected in narrative, as there is the analogy between understanding of a text and understanding of the 'self'. As Sarbin noted, "people think, perceive, imagine, and make moral choices according to narrative structures" [21, 8]. We interpret ourselves through narrative or continuous self-interpretation, and by doing so, we allocate certain events in the flow of life that have meaning for us and are loaded with evaluative power.

Although the approaches in narrative psychology differ, according to McAdams, they agree on six common principles. The first principle lies in the idea that 'the self is storied' [17, 244]. The identity or 'the self' then is "both the storyteller and the stories that are told" [17, 244]. The second principle, as defined by McAdams, is that 'stories integrate lives' by bringing together "different self-ascribed tendencies, roles, goals, and remembered events into a synchronic pattern", and it is through the narrative that people try to "derive general/semantic meanings from particular/episodic experiences in life" [17, 244]. The third principle is that 'stories are told in social relationships, which means that stories are congenial with expectations

and norms of a given society [17, 245]. The next principle is that 'stories change over time'. As McAdams explains, some events and memories of them may become more salient for a person or may fade away over time, which happens due to changes in the social position of a person, their goals, concerns and motivations [17, 246]. Identity, as reflected in narratives, is not understood as something stable, but rather as variable and fluid, changing along with its socio-cultural environment and trying to find its place in semantic coordinates of the era. The fifth principle, 'stories are cultural texts', encompasses the idea that narratives being a product of a certain culture, are created according to its norms, rules, values and traditions, and in this way are capable of reflecting the culture, wherein they were created [17, 246]. The last principle listed by McAdams is that 'some stories are better than others' [17, 247-248], either from the standpoint of evaluation of their coherence or complexity or a moral perspective the stories suggest – as any story revolves around actors and actions, which can be judged as being good or reproachable in a given society. Dominant narratives of culture and values determine the form of narratives. Every person just chooses, and/or adapts available narrative forms (genres) to construct their stories according to their understanding of the socio-cultural reality.

In psychoanalytic therapy heuristic and communicatively significant individual cases or autobiographies of people are studied to construct typical models of mental structures on their basis. This analysis of narratives is largely based on the ideas of intertextuality, multiple interpretations, and inherence of text and context that dictates its assessment; and is carried out by using content analysis techniques. Thus, psychoanalytic therapy appears to be a set of strategies of interpretation. It introduces two definitions of narrative: wide – as the process of generating stories, as a narration in general; and narrow – as a specific, clearly defined form of narrative, which is characterized by conflict and its solution and, consequently, changes in the state of actant or the situation at the end of the narrative as opposed to its beginning [5; 10; 21]. Narratives of personal experience in psychoanalytic therapy are meant to change the patient's life by retelling it, offering another interpretation, and constructing a more satisfactory experience. The basic technique of narrative therapy is externalization, which is a linguistic practice that helps people to separate themselves from the problem-saturated stories that they perceive as their own identity by looking at their problems being off-stage [18, 18]. Anthony Giddens considers psychoanalysis as a genre of biographical truth,

a theoretical and therapeutic resource for the creation of reflexive-organized narrative about self-serving as a defence mechanism because autobiographical thinking became a constitutive element of identity in contemporary social life [11, 53-54]. Thus, within psychology narrative can serve as a theoretical approach (in narrative psychology), and as an object of empirical analysis (in psychoanalytic or narrative therapy).

The problem of reflection and formation of identity in the narrative becomes an equally important object of research in sociology. According to Franzosi, sociologists should study narratives, as "narrative texts are packed with sociological information, and a great deal of our empirical evidence is in narrative form" [8, 517]. Sociologists consider narratives as a form of human behaviour, as social actions arising under certain conditions and circumstances, and are guided by other participants in communication. It is by means of narrative that the life of a person becomes a meaningful whole, and social life, in its turn, is reflected as the interplay of individual stories. The current stage of sociological research is characterized by consistent narrativization, and social scientists formulate following postulates of narrative sociology [15, 21-22]: 1) all socialized individuals are storytellers who are constantly involved in situations of potential storytelling; 2) most speech acts and self-representations contain at least some elements of narrative; 3) narrators offer different versions of the same events to different listeners at different times; 4) narratives are potential sites both of conflict/competition and cooperation/consensus; 5) different levels of narrative competence and uncertainty of subjective positions may result in incompleteness of narratives; 6) narratives range from the personal to the institutional to the cultural, exist for varying lengths of time, and are subjected to change; 7) as information without interpretation does not exist, all sociological data are already interpreted; 8) all sociological facts take the form of narrative, as they are processed through some story structure that renders events as factual; 9) data collection presupposes entering respondents' lives that are partly formed by still unfolding stories. Hence, research subjects will likely tell different stories about the same events at different times to different listeners; 10) sociology can only be a science of interpretations. Sociology has agreed that specific linguistic mechanisms and variables constituting narratives underlie and reflect social relations relevant for the field of their primary interest: gender, age and class, social roles and status, etc.

Conclusions. Narrative, once the object of interest and research in literary studies, has travelled a long epistemological way to become one of the central research domains in modern humanities. The advent of postmodern philosophical thought with its interest in human identity, the global tendency of humanities to explore different aspects of our life through language and speech realized in narratives gave rise to the syncretism of methodological tools and approaches applied across sciences, along with the possibility of interdisciplinary research. As a result, such interdisciplinary branches of scientific research as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, linguocultural studies, cognitive linguistics, forensic linguistics, to name but a few, have gradually gained ground. All these branches investigate specific phenomena of psychological, social, cultural, cognitive, forensic etc. interest as reflected in language and speech, with narrative being either an object or a tool of such investigation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bakhtin M. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays / Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.; M. Holquist, Ed. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. 450 p.

2. Benwell B., Stokoe E. (2009). Discourse and Identity. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009. 314 p.

3. Brockmeier J., Harre, R. Narrative. Problems and promises of an alternative paradigm. *Narrative and Identity: Studies in Autobiography, Self and Culture* / J. Brockmeier, D. Carbaugh. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2001. P. 39-58.

4. Bruner J.. Actual Minds, Possible Worlds. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986. 222 p.

5. Bruner J. Acts of Meaning. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990. 208 p.

6. Budniakiewicz T. Fundamentals of Story Logic: Introduction to Greimassian semiotics. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 1992. 246 p.

7. Chafe W. Some things that narratives tell us about the mind. *Narrative Thought and Narrative Language* / B. K. Britton, A. D. Pellegrini. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1990. P. 79–98.

8. Franzosi R. Narrative analysis – or why (and how) sociologists should be interested in narrative. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 1998. N 24. P. 517-554.

9. Franzosi R. Quantitative narrative analysis. Los Angeles: Sage, 2010. 175 p.

10. Gergen M. M., Gergen K. J. Narratives in action. *Narrative Inquiry*. 2006. N 16:1. P. 112–121.

11. Giddens A. Modernity and Self-Identity. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991. 264 p.

12. Greimas A. J. Structural Semantics: An Attempt at a Method. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983. 325 p.

13. Levi-Strauss C. The Structural Study of Myth. *The Journal of American Folklore.* 1955. N 68 (270), Myth: A Symposium (Oct.- Dec. 1955). P. 428-444.

14. Lyotard J.-F. The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge / trans. G. Bennington and B. Massumi. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984. 144 p.

15. Maines D. Narrative's moment and sociology's phenomena: Toward a narrative sociology. *Sociological Quarterly*. 1993. N 34. P. 17-38.

16. McAdams D. P. The Stories We Live by: Personal Myths and the Making of the Self. New York: London: The Guilford Press, 1997. 336 p.

17. McAdams D. P. Personal Narratives and the Life Story. *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* / O. P. John, R. R. Robins, L. A. Pervin. NY: Guilford Press, 2008. P. 241-261.

18. Morgan A. What is narrative therapy? An easy-to-read introduction. Adelaide, South Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications, 2000. 136 p.

19. Propp V. Morphology of the Folktale. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968. 184 p.

20. Riessman C. K. Performing identities in illness narrative: Masculinity and multiple sclerosis. *Qualitative Research*. 2003. N 3 (1). P. 5-33.

21. Sarbin T. Narrative psychology. The storied nature of human conduct. New York: Praeger, 1986. 303 p.

22. Schmid W. Narratology. An Introduction / Trans. A. Starritt. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2010. 272 p.

23. Van Dijk T. A. (1980). Story Comprehension: An Introduction. *Poetics*. 1980. N 9. P. 1-21.

REFERENCES

1. Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.; M. Holquist, Ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

2. Benwell, B., Stokoe, E. (2009). *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

3. Brockmeier, J., & Harre, R. (2001). Narrative. Problems and promises of an alternative paradigm. In J. Brockmeier, D. Carbaugh (Eds.), *Narrative and Identity: Studies in Autobiography, Self and Culture* (pp. 39-58). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

4. Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

5. Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of Meaning. Cambridge*, MA: Harvard University Press.

6. Budniakiewicz, T. (1992). *Fundamentals of Story Logic: Introduction to Greimassian semiotics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

7. Chafe, W. (1990). Some things that narratives tell us about the mind. In B. K. Britton, A. D. Pellegrini (Eds.), *Narrative Thought and Narrative Language* (pp. 79–98). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

8. Franzosi, R. (1998). Narrative analysis – or why (and how) sociologists should be interested in narrative. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *24*, 517-554.

9. Franzosi, R. (2010). Quantitative narrative analysis. Los Angeles: Sage

10. Gergen, M. M., Gergen, K. J. (2006). Narratives in action. *Narrative Inquiry*, *16:1*, 112–121.

11. Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

12. Greimas, A. J. (1983). *Structural Semantics: An Attempt at a Method*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

13. Levi-Strauss, C. (1955). The Structural Study of Myth. *The Journal of American Folklore, 68* (270), Myth: A Symposium (Oct.- Dec. 1955), 428-444.

14. Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge. trans. G. Bennington and B. Massumi. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

15. Maines, D. (1993). Narrative's moment and sociology's phenomena: Toward a narrative sociology. *Sociological Quarterly*, *34*, 17-38.

16. McAdams, D. P. (1997). *The Stories We Live by: Personal Myths and the Making of the Self*. New York: London: The Guilford Press.

17. McAdams, D. P. (2008). Personal Narratives and the Life Story. In O. P. John, R. R. Robins, L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (pp. 241-261). NY: Guilford Press.

18. Morgan, A. (2000). *What is narrative therapy? An easy-to-read introduction*. Adelaide, South Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.

19. Propp, V. (1968). *Morphology of the Folktale*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

20. Riessman, C. K. (2003). Performing identities in illness narrative: Masculinity and multiple sclerosis. *Qualitative Research*, *3* (1), 5-33.

21. Sarbin, T. (1986). *Narrative psychology. The storied nature of human conduct*. New York: Praeger.

22. Schmid, W. (2010). *Narratology. An Introduction*. Trans. A. Starritt. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

23. Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). Story Comprehension: An Introduction. *Poetics, 9*, 1-21.

ВІД ВИТОКІВ НАРАТИВНИХ СТУДІЙ ДО «НАРАТИВНОГО ПОВОРОТУ»

Єгорова Анна Вікторівна
доктор філософії (філологія),
доцент кафедри іноземної філології та перекладу
Національного транспортного університету
вул. Омеляновича-Павленка, 1, Київ, Україна

У даній статті викладаються теоретичні та методологічні основи сучасного розуміння поняття наративу в науці, що вимагає глибокого й всебічного теоретичного аналізу відповідної літератури. Передусім, ця стаття висвітлює еволюцію розвитку поняття наративу. Колись об'єкт інтересу дослідників виключно в літературознавстві, наратив як об'єкт дослідження пройшов довгий епістемологічний шлях, й, нарешті, став однією з центральних областей дослідження більшості сучасних гуманітарних, соціальних і природничих наук, таких як історія, історіографія, антропологія, соціологія, філософія, культурологія, теологія, право, медицина, психотерапія й, таким чином, наратив став об'єктом міждисциплінарних досліджень. Така зміна, що називається «Наративним поворотом», була викликана завдяки усвідомленню науковцями того, що функціонування різних форм знання (особистого, універсального, соціального або інституційного) можна інтерпретувати тільки через їх наративну природу. Таким чином, необхідно було простежити зміни поняття наративу паралельно з основними змінами як лінгвістичних, так і філософсько-наукових парадигм, що виходить далеко за рамки традиційної суто філологічної науки. У той час як в рамках структуралістської парадигми дослідження були зосереджені виключно на формально-змістовній структурі наративу, виявленні універсальних наративних моделей та універсальних парадигматичних і синтагматичних відношеннях між елементами, прагматична парадигма зосередила свою увагу на особливостях наративів з огляду на комунікативну ситуацію, соціокультурні факторами, що впливають на породження й розуміння наративу, прагматичні функції, умови й цілі розповіді. У когнітивно-дискурсивній парадигмі наратив став розглядатися як засіб, інструмент й форма упорядкування суб'єктивного досвіду та ситуативних моделей мовців. Власне, саме таке розуміння викликало інтерес до наративного аналізу в філософії, психології та соціології, що й призвело до широкого кола міждисциплінарних досліджень.
*   **Ключові слова:** *наратив, наративний поворот, лінгвістичні парадигми, постмодерністська філософія.*