

M. M. BAKHTIN'S SCIENTIFIC VIEW ON NARRATOLOGY

Bektursinova A.M.

Lecturer at the Department of Russian Language and Literature

Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh

Nukus, Republic of Uzbekistan ORCID: 0000-0002-3727-967X

ayka19_94@mail.ru

Abstract:

The article is devoted to the problem of narratology in linguistics, in particular, to the scientific thoughts of M.M. Bakhtin on this problem. The article says that M.M. Bakhtin did not use the term "narratology" in his works, but at the same time this issue was not alien to him. It is also mentioned that the main thing in the scientific heritage of M.M. Bakhtin is that it develops its own theory of the novel genre as the historical poetics of the novel.

Keywords: narratology, Bakhtin, rhetoric, linguo-rhetoric, event, metalinguistics.

Introduction

Modern narratology is much broader than the theory of literary narrative, from the "swaddling clothes" of which it grew. It has also departed far from the project of a universal "grammar of storytelling" put forward by the French structuralists. In our time, narratology is an interdisciplinary extension of literary criticism beyond the limits of its autonomy. Now it is the sphere of general humanitarian cognition, aimed at cognitive mechanisms and multimedial (not only verbal) possibilities for the formation and relay of the event experience. Such an anthropological breadth would undoubtedly be very much in tune with Bakhtin.

Materials and methods

M.M. Bakhtin did not use the usual terms "narrative", "narrator", "narratology", but he was far from indifferent to narratological problems. In the 1920s, he appreciated Käthe Friedemann's neo-Kantian work *The Role of the Narrator in the Epic* (1910), which has not yet been translated into Russian. And in the early 1970s, Bakhtin became interested in a review by an aspiring German narratologist Wolf Schmid's "Poetics of Composition" by B. A. Uspensky (1970) and responded to this review. Moreover, in 1973, Bakhtin added the section "Concluding Remarks" to his work of the 1930s, "The Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel." These remarks are mostly narratological in nature and are perceived as a response to Gérard Genette's classic study "Narrative Discourse" published a year earlier [4].

Results

Bakhtin interpreted the event etymologically: as an event, an interaction, a meeting of two realities [3]. At least one of these realities is the reality of human consciousness. "With the advent of consciousness in the world [...]," he wrote, "the event of being [...] becomes completely different, because a new and main actor of the event enters the stage of earthly existence – the witness and judge" [1, p. 396]. Bakhtin's event is intentional, its event status depends on the value orientation of consciousness, which "cannot change being, so to speak, materially [...] it can only change the meaning of existence [...] Truth and truth are inherent not in existence itself, but only in being known and expressed" [1, pp. 396-397].

Discussion

Eventfulness, like truthfulness, is not a "natural" quality of what is happening around us, it is a special (narrative) way of relating human consciousness to being, an alternative to processuality and ritualism. An event, from this perspective, represents the narrative status of a segment of life in our experience. For without narrative (fractal) formalization on the part of consciousness, it is impossible to think about any events by contemplating the continuum of what is happening around us.

It is fundamentally important that Bakhtin's eventfulness, despite its dependence on consciousness, is not subjective, but intersubjective. It is determined by the narrative intention of the "witness and the judge", who is the narrator who excites and inspires the addressee's receptive intention by the intrigue of his storytelling. Attention to the receptive side of narration draws the latest narratology to the rhetorical category of ethos. Western narratology has already become interested in this category [8]. According to Ricoeur's profound remark, "there are no ethically neutral narratives" because "the anticipation of ethical considerations is included in the very structure of the act of narration" [6, p. This refers us to the young Bakhtin's idea that in the creative result of aesthetic activity (a work) its "ethical moment" can always be "transcribed".

The intersubjectivity of narrative discourse is not a game of subjects, it is one of the most important ontological mechanisms of culture: narrative practices are a socio-cultural tool for the formation and retransmission of the eventual experience of human presence in a world where singular, unpredictable, irreversible (i.e., event-related) changes are constantly occurring. At the same time, the opposite mechanism of precedent human experience functions in culture: the experience of the processuality of natural existence and the ritual nature of human behavior. In light of this dichotomy, modern narratology should be defined as the science of humanity's eventual experience.

Bakhtin's concept of artistic authorship was mainly formed in his early philosophical work "The Author and the Hero in Aesthetic Activity". In his notes of the 1950s-1970s, he remains faithful to his original view of the figure of the author as the aesthetic subject of the artistic

integrity of the work. For example, in *The Problem of the Text* (1959-1960) he asserts that literature is the art of "indirect speaking" [1, p. 289]. Here, "the primary author is clothed in silence. But this silence can take various forms of expression" [1, p. 353]. Such an author is quite identical to the "implicit" author of modern narratology, especially the "abstract" author of Wolf Schmid. For a concrete human subject ("I myself," as Bakhtin put it) can be "only a character, but not a primary author" [1, p. 354].

At the same time, Bakhtin emphasized the specificity of artistic narrativity, for which it is not so much the fictionality of the narrated world that is fundamental, but the non-identity of the author and the narrator: if the author "speaks with a direct word," then he "turns into a publicist, moralist, scientist, etc." [1, p. 353]. Speaking in Bakhtin's way, the "primary author" of Karamzin's "Poor Liza" is truly "an anthropomorphic hypostasis [...], the personification of the intentionality of the work" [7, p. 57], while the narrator of "The History of the Russian State" is a biographically concrete person: Nikolai Mikhailovich Karamzin. The meaning of the first text, according to Bakhtin's lectures, is determined by the internal collision of nature and culture, while the meaning of the second is revealed by Karamzin's "note "Old and New Russia" submitted to Alexander I" [2, p. 413].

Bakhtin's metalinguistics deserves special attention with its emphasis on the communicative functionality of the word. It was a kind of development and refraction of classical rhetoric. As Renata Lachmann rightly notes, Bakhtin's intellectual pursuits are closely linked to the rhetorical tradition [5].

Bakhtin began to think about metallinguistics in the 1960s, but already in 1929, using the material of Dostoevsky's novels, he posed one of the key narratological problems - the problem of the verbal presentation of narration: "the word of the hero and the word of the story" in their correlation and interaction. At the same time, in his co-authored book "Marxism and the Philosophy of Language" (1929) with V.N. Voloshinov, the concept of "improper direct" speech, which is so productive for modern narratology, is put forward. In revising his book on Dostoevsky, Bakhtin contrasts metallinguistics and linguistics, which "study one and the same concrete, very complex and multifaceted phenomenon - the word, but study it from different angles and from different angles. They should complement each other, but not be mixed" [3, p. 203].

However, the main lesson of Bakhtin's legacy for modern narratology is that Bakhtin built his theory of the novel genre as the historical poetics of the novel (which, in particular, is stated in the subtitle of the essay "The Forms of Time and Chronotope in the Novel").

Conclusions

The most relevant perspective of narratological science today is the transition from purely theoretical, we would even say, scholastic, narratology to historical narratology - the

narratology of "big time". Along the way, the significance of Bakhtin's intellectual heritage will inevitably increase.

Thus, Bakhtin's meanings are firmly rooted in the "big time" of world culture, and therefore they bring and will continue to bear their spiritual fruits.

References

1. Bakhtin M.M. Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva [Aesthetics of Word Creativity]. Moscow, Iskuststvo Publ., 1979. 424 p. (In Russian).
2. Bakhtin M.M. Sobriety of Sochi [at 6 (7) p.]. T. 2. M.: Russian Dictionary, 2000. 799 p.
3. Bakhtin M.M. Collected Works [in 6 (7) volumes]. T. 6. Moscow: Russian Dictionaries; Languages of Slavic Culture, 2002. 799 p. (In Russian).
4. Zhenett Zh. Narrative Discourse // Zhenett Zh. Figury. T. 2. Transl. from French. Moscow: Izd. Sabashnikovs, 1998. S. 60-280.
5. Lachmann R. Ritorika i dialogicnost' v myshlenii Bakhtina [Rhetoric and dialogicity in Bakhtin's thinking]. № 1 (3). Moscow, 1996.
6. Ricoeur P. Ya-sam kak drugoj [Self as another]. Moscow: Izd. Humanitarian Literature, 2008. 416 p. (In Russian).
7. Shmid V. Narratologiya [Narratology]. Moscow, Languages of Slavic Culture Publ., 2008. 304 p. (In Russian).
8. Altes L. Ethos and Narrative Interpretation: The Negotiation of Values in Fiction. University of Nebraska Press, 2014. 344 p.