



Narrative Discourse as an Emergent Phenomenon: Global Semiotic Approach

Inna Livytska

*Volodymyr Vynnychenko Central Ukrainian State Pedagogical University, Ukraine
innalivytska@gmail.com*

APA Citation:

Livytska, I. Narrative discourse as an emergent phenomenon: global semiotic approach., *Journal of Narrative and Language*, 9(16), 57-67

Abstract

This theoretical paper continues a spectrum of research on the sign character of narrative discourse against a background of the modern post-classical theory of narrativity. It aims to uncover the relationships between the meaning of the narrative text and sign signification, assuming the narrative telic aspects (global semiotics) intentionally govern discourse. The global semiotic approach (Sebeok, 2001) views a narrative discourse as a self-organizing entity with a purposeful (telic) character to all its constituent parts, which turns a static text into a dynamic whole through the process of reading/perception/interpretation. The key notion for analysis of emergency is the term *Umwelt* (Jakob von Uexküll, 2001) to denote the perceptual world in which an organism (and a human) exists and acts as a subject. Therefore, *Umwelt* represents a human's perceptual boundary, which modifies the surrounding by the human's subjective perspective. As *Umwelt* can be attributed to both biological and abiotic texts, creation in the narrative discourse is compared to a semiotic study of comparative *Umwelten* (Cobley, 2013) where the narrative is defined as a modeling device for the world created through embodied subjectivity. It has been stressed that focusing on the subjective sphere of information exchange and processing from the position of global semiotics necessitates the introduction of basic principles of biosemiotics (i.e. semiotic scaffolding etc.) and teleology (i.e. cause, purpose, result) to the analysis of narrative discourse. This provides the potential for further research in this domain.

Keywords: narrative, meaning emergence, telic aspect, global semiotics, *Umwelt*

Introduction

In the general sphere of semiotics influenced by the ideas of Charles S. Peirce, on the one hand, and the global semiotic ideas of Thomas A. Sebeok, on the other, there is a frequent tendency to speak on the "living signs" addressing abiotic forms of sign systems (i.e. fictional texts). Quite significant evidence in favor of this statement comes from the global semiotics domain, stating that any organism (a life form) is a carrier of life and thus any sign is "a necessary element of any semiotic system" (Kull, 2002). Being a part of a bigger system, signs (as a unity) are surrounded by other signs, and form "a biotext" as a semiotic whole. The process of text interpretation, therefore, is viewed as a continuous semiosis, as the interpretation of one sign through another (Krampen et al., 1987) as a certain semiosis of *Umwelten* limited by subjective boundaries of personal world mapping. Adhering to the global semiotic framework, this paper aims at unveiling relations between the meaning of the narrative text and a sign

process, assuming an intentional character of the narrative discourse governed by telic aspects of semiotics.

The following research questions have been formulated: (1) What is the nature of narrativity and its semiotic potential in world creation? (2) How does the subjectivity of narrative turn it into a dynamic entity? (3) What is the role of subjectivity in narrative interpretation?

To reach these objectives the paper applies the qualitative methodology of analysis from both a national and international body of research on semiotics to the findings of modern post-classical narratology. The paper starts with the definition of the object of study in global semiotics (i.e. life is semiosis) in the *Semiotics Becomes Global: a Current State of Research* section. Then it moves to the *Poetic Nature of Narrativity* section, dealing with the basic features of narrative: (i) situatedness, (ii) event sequencing, (iii) worldmaking or world disruption, and (iv) what's like, to aid in understanding the dynamic character of semiotic modeling and arousal of narrativity through intentionality covered in the section: *Intentionality and Emergence of Narrativity*. The paper finishes with the *Conclusion*, where the novelty of the global semiotic research on narrative is compared to the conventional literary studies in literary narrative and avant-garde studies on multimodal narrative, suggesting promising endeavors for further research in this domain from the perspective of global semiotics.

Global Semiotics: a Current State of Research

Productive attempts have been made to examine the correspondence between semiotics and biology to understand the concept of life, including the famous assumption that semiosis and life are coextensive. The problem, however, remained unsolved by biologists and semioticians due to the ambiguity and diversity of the definitions of the concept (the problem has been widely analyzed by Barbieri (Barbieri, 2001) and more extensively by Emmeche (1998, 2000) and modern representatives of the Tartu semiotic school (Grishakova & Lotman, 2009). These studies make the case for not oversimplifying the equation between the two concepts either in semiotics or in biology. At the same time, it becomes evident that the two sciences can come to a more comprehensive understanding of the concepts of “life” and “semiosis” with common efforts and categories of analysis. For example, the minimum meaning bearing unit in biosemiotic writings is the cell and in semiotic writings, a sign. Since one sign is always a part of a bigger system of other signs, called a “text”, semiosis, in its turn, presupposes the action of many signs as a textual process (Kull, 2002, p.329).

Recognition of any text as a composition of signs (Kull, 2002) puts an end to the contradiction between “sign semiotics” and “text semiotics” (Lotman, 2002). Additionally, adherence to the biosemiotic view provides us with the methodology for the analysis of semiosis in certain parts of a text (where a new meaning emerges or is given birth to) and semiosis of the whole text (as a self-referring entity). Collaboration between multiple levels of the text, when analyzed with the tools of biosemiotics, are self-referencing, characterized by “purposeful behavior” (Alexander, 2009), mediating discourse development, similar to the process of translation, described by Krampen et al. (1987) when a complete set of conditions and patterns is created (“transferred”) that guarantees independent life for a new organism (Kull, 2002, p.330).

One more essential point here is the question of emergency. In self-referring systems, the concept of exterior reference or functional differentiation is viewed as a certain precondition of semiosis. Quoting the words of Hoffmeyer (1999, p.156) “it is a stable integration of self-reference and other-reference which establishes the minimum requirement for an Umwelt and thereby sets living systems apart from all their non-living predecessors”. Therefore, principles

and tools of holistic biology can be successfully employed for text analysis (both functional and non-fictional) of the emergent meaning of signs, causing discourse dynamics.

By micro-processes of discourse development, one should understand “icons” and “indices” as purely poetic tools, grounded on the principles of metonymic contiguity and metaphoric similarity, with a primary focus put on micro-processes of meaning emergence in a narrative text, treating it as a holistic self-organizing whole, capable of functional differentiation as a requirement for Umwelt (Hoffmeyer, 1999). In terms of linguistic approach, this functional differentiation is realised through the concept of subjectivity, as an imminent embodiment of the writer-reader perspective, as a central idea of narratology and an emergent phenomenon, deeply rooted in the cultural layers in the “broadest possible way, as constituted by the practices in the whole way of life” (Cobley, 2008).

Poetic Nature of Narrativity

To answer the question of what narrative fiction is and which features turn a narrative into a narrative discourse, it is necessary to define the basic aspects of narrative fiction to see the way they interact with each other. This will lead to a range of other questions, concerning the structure of the fiction text and the very nature of the narration, their compatibilities, and differences concerning discourse.

Narrative fiction as a text represents a place where a world-creating strategy is realised in “the process of reader-text interactional dialogue” (Andreeva, 2009, p.65). Moreover, mainly through this dialogic interaction of the reader with the text, a kind of narrative intentionality is contrasted to other textual strategies, including performativity, iterativity, and descriptively, turning the process of reading into a *polydiscursive* entity. This discursive polyphony, characterized by the omnipresence of different communicative strategies, serves the ground for *interdiscursiveness*, describing interrelations between different communicative strategies (Andreeva, 2009, p.66). At the same time, according to the prevailing role of a certain communicative strategy, the texts, in their turn, create either narrative, iterative or descriptive discourses.

One of the peculiar features of differentiating narrative texts from other types of texts is the so-called “here and now effect” or “Origo des Jetzt-Hier-Ich-Systems” observed by Hamburger (1993, pp.29-30) and evoking the empathetic feeling as one of the central text-creating elements. A more or less common prototypical narrative model then includes the basic elements of (i) *situatedness*, (ii) *event sequencing*, (iii) *worldmaking or world disruption*, and (iv) *what’s like*, a term used by Herman and philosophers of the mind to refer to a reader’s experience and consciousness in-flux and qualia (Herman, 2009). That is where the important debate concerning the nature of consciousness comes forth, calling for a more careful insight into the cognitive and philosophical sides of knowledge as meaning making. For the convenience of analysis, we will start with the first element of the narrative model mentioned above, situatedness, moving then to the other three, and finishing with ideas concerning “alive knowledge”, “consciousness in-flux”, qualia and Umwelt.

Situatedness

Self-evident as it might seem, the general definition of narrative fiction is associated with storytelling, embedded in the contexts of telling and grounded in the discourse, reflecting interactions between text producers, semiotic artifacts, and the interpreters of these narrative productions working with cultural, institutional, genre-based, and text-specific protocols (Herman, 2009, p.17). Manifestations of this so-called socio-communicative environment are imprinted in the narrative in the form of cues and concepts (icons) representing a well known twofold model of Saussurian signifier and signified ([1916] 1954), evoking meanings from the

words. In stating that narrative representation encompasses both (a) the semiotic cues scattered in the text and (b) the characters, situations and events which constitute the so-called story world (Herman, 2009, p.7), we have to view the theory of interpretation as a process of inferring meanings from the cues to reconstruct the story world as a specific occasion of storytelling.

Herman (2009) estimates that the specific contextual situation does not only provide for implicit meanings about certain communicative goals of the narrative but also motivates the distribution of cues and thus rearranges the whole system of cues, adjusting it according to contextual needs. If so, then the elements constituting the narrative system are characterized by a sort of cause and purpose, intended to evoke a certain emotional response on the part of the reader. This causality is regarded to be an *intentional phenomenon*, inseparable from personal conventions and involuntary present in the communicative grounding of narration (see Linde, 1993). In other words, this “background” information, which the narrative is grounded in, represents a cultural layer in the broadest possible sense (i.e. beliefs, expectations, symbols, etc.), which Searle calls *intentionality*, the central notion to his "Philosophy of Mind" represented in the capacity of mental states to be *about* worldly objects (Searle, 2010, pp.48-62). Arguing that intentionality is exclusively the mental power of minds to represent or symbolize over things, the aboutness of properties and states of affairs in the external world (Searle, 1983), Searle defends the main thesis of his argument with Derrida: a statement can be disjoined from the original intentionality of its author, no longer connected to the original author, while still being able to produce meaning. Searle maintained that even if one was to see a written statement with no knowledge of authorship it would still be impossible to escape the question of intentionality, because “a meaningful sentence is just a standing possibility of the (intentional) speech act” (Searle, 1977, p.202).

Thus, this embedded contextual intentionality of the narratives represents nothing more than a broad socio-communicative environment in which they are produced. David Herman justifies this by providing the following example:

Thus, if I construct in my mind a representation of my own life story but never share it with anyone else (or perhaps mumble the story unintelligibly), I have nonetheless produced that account in the context structured by conventions for narrating the story of one’s life – conventions with which I bring myself into relation even when I seek to resist or subvert them. (Herman, 2009, pp.17-18)

Preliminarily, one can verify how crucial this socio-communicative environment is by comparing different kinds of texts (narrative and not narrative by nature but with a similar structure) by immersing them into contrasting discourse contexts. The account of emotional retrospection of the first-person narration coupled with the elements of cultural context and fictional characters produces the corresponding atmosphere and “background” in which the storyline should be interpreted. By contrast, non-narrative representation of a scientific manner lacks emotional standing and is not grounded in the words of characters, even those quoted by them. These altered occasions of reality representation show that it makes a difference what perspective or focus is chosen for interpretation as well as the type of writing about the events, affecting the basic propositional context and the truth status as such.

Event sequencing

According to the structuralist definition, taken from “Narrative Fiction” (Rimmon-Kenan, 2002, p.2), the term narrative fiction suggests the representation of the succession of events, which differentiate the latter from the rest of literary texts (e.g. expository prose and lyrical poetry). Implying that the meaning of an event is something that happens and can be rendered

by a verb or named as an action, this definition can be extrapolated further to a philosophic view, defining an event as any *change of action* (even when not represented by words).

This understanding of events in fiction denotes *any* change the subject undergoes as the result of other events or caused by other events (Andreeva, 2006, p.46). That is where the term “a succession of events” comes from, meaning that a narrative structure usually consists of several events arranged in a certain order, prompted either by the inner micro-processes of narrative composition or by the narrative logic of narration as such. Speaking about the narrative fiction, Roland Barthes observed that the order of events can be motivated or unmotivated by causality links, subjecting the earlier structuralist definition to criticism, and necessitating a more rigid distinction between “text”, “story” and “narration”. Therefore, the three-level structure of event representation suggested by Genette (1972) is based on the sound distinction between “story”, “text” and “narration” correspondently (p.71). Succinctly put, the “story” is the succession of events designated from their disposition in the text, and then reconstructed in chronological order. On the other hand, the “text” presents the events in the order arranged by the author for the sake of aesthetic purposes and characterization through a certain focus or perspective. Finally, the “narration” is realized in the production of the text by the narrator (i.e. in a fictional narrative, the communication cycle goes from a fictional narrator to a fictional narratee).

Described above are two- and three-level models of event presentation in the fictional text referring to the notion of “narration” as the mode of telling (i.e. storytelling) about the situations and events in flux (Herman, 2009, p.1). At the same time, the four-dimensional model of event shifts the focus of analysis from the event as a textual category to the event as a cultural phenomenon (Cobley, 2013) and the category of aesthetics. Mainly in a fictional narrative, events become a part of the *subjective* experience of the implicit reader and through mental categorization they enter a wider self-organizing entity of meaningful relations between the objective world and the human semiosphere (Lotman, 2002), or what is called by German biologist Jakob von Uexküll, the *Umwelt* (Cobley, 2013).

Furthermore, from the biosemiotic perspective, the event in the fictional narrative is considered a certain “organic state”, fixed in the semiotic text, produced by the “cosmological artistic agency of the author” (Eko, 1988, p.93). The rules and logic of events sequencing and the characters are thus governed by the “fictional reality” in which the whole narrative text is transformed into the discourse in the process of abstraction from the text and cognitive modeling of the story world. Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan (2002) explains this human ability for abstraction by the intuitive skill of users in processing stories, i.e. “being able to retell them, to recognise variants of the same story in another medium, and so on” (p.7). Further support in favor of this idea comes from renowned attempts of the narratologists to disjoint the “autonomous layer of meaning” (Propp, 1968) in narration, drawing the distinction between an apparent and an implicit level of narration. Citing Greimas:

[...] an apparent level of narration, at which the manifestations of narration are subject to the specific exigencies of the linguistic substances through which they are expressed, and an immanent level, constituting a sort of common structural trunk, at which narrativity is situated and organized prior to its manifestations. A common semiotic level is thus distinct from the linguistic level and is logically prior to it, whatever the language chosen for manifestation. (Greimas, 1976, p.23)

What can be inferred from this statement is the existence of one more implication that the story, as a sequence of events, is grounded in *abstraction*. The style, the language and the medium of representation as it is immanently present in the human consciousness, prior to its comprehension in the story, leads the researcher to the key question of cognitive narratology

on the pre-existing of narrative intelligence in children and adults, and a possibility of medical use of narratives in treating trauma and psychological disorders. Though recently some evidence has been provided justifying the use of narratives in treatment of trauma, the “technical side” of the healing process still remains terra incognita, demanding common efforts from linguistics, psychologists and biologists in the description of the *worldmaking* and experiencing the narrative *what’s like* as a story world-in-flux (Herman, 2009).

Worldmaking and consciousness in flux

The question of fictional worldmaking as a form of virtual reality has been long discussed in the philosophy of art, language, and mind, with special emphasis on modulating different virtual artificial systems of signs in computer programs and simulators proposed by computational narratology. The basis for the existence of a virtual reality in computer science constitutes the possibility of submerging into the artificially created world with the help of computer technologies. That fact represents the point where narrative intelligence meets artificial intelligence (Gervas, Lönneker-Rodman, Meister & Peinado, 2006). This perspective brings into the focus the questions of Interactive Narrative (IN) and Interactive Storytelling (IS) by considering a range of widely used narrative models (those of Aristotle, Propp, and Barthes) in their adaptation for AI story generation or Artificial Narrative Intelligence (cf. Livytska, 2019). A very good example of such interdisciplinary productive work is *The Living Handbook of Narratology* (<https://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/>) providing open access to resources in this regard.

Recognition of the need for closer collaboration between the humanities and the computer sciences has already provided some productive outcomes in understanding the way virtual reality is digitalized. It also opened a spectrum of opportunities for further research on story generation, especially in connection with multimodal narrative models. But when it comes to cooperation between the Computational Narratology and Literary Studies, attending only to structuralist and formalist narrative representation in terms of “story”, “plot” or “sjuzhet” doesn’t seem relevant to the fact modern narratology is the study of signs in abiotic and living systems. In finding a link between semiotic processes of meaning emergence in narrative fictional texts and artificial modeling of this process utilizing computer techniques, the possibility of reopening the door to the anatomy of culture as a living system seems viable. The approach suggested here comes from the emerging science of global semiotics, combining the methods and theory of semiotics with a sphere of biology, dealing with living systems and methods of cybersemiotics, dealing with abiotic autopoietic systems.

An important presupposition that justifies the use of biology in semiotics is the existence of meaningful communication in all living species apart from *Homo sapiens* (Kull, Emmeche, and Hoffmeyer, 2011, p.2). Adherence to this position will refer us to the thoughts about the sign nature of all living systems and the ideas of von Uexküll about animal’s interpretation of their world, Umwelt, mediated by purpose and causality, i.e. intentionality and teleology.

Intentionality and Emergency of Narrative

Observing the fundamental role of narrative in human society, scholars acknowledged the exposure of a human to certain narrative practice, so-called “Narrative Practice Hypothesis” (NPH) and “folk psychology”(FP) (Hutto, 2008) as a prerequisite for the human ability to construct and consume narratives. Defining narrative as a specifically human form of semiosis, present in multiple forms of culture, “narrative analysis” proved to be deeply embedded in the modes of interpersonal communication, expressing values, emotions, needs and relations of participants in their interaction (cf. Labovian experiment in New York City (Herman, 2009)). Moreover, not all kinds of narratives can explicitly encourage children to understand their desires and needs, or moral values.

If our capacity to make sense of ourselves and others is not built-in – if it depends on engaging in special kinds of social practices – then this influences how we should think about a number of important topics. It matters for our understanding of certain mental dysfunctions and how we might attempt to treat them... [...] Furthermore, if our capacity for making sense of ourselves and others is not wholly built-in, then this raises the tantalizing possibility that, even as adults, we might be able to improve and enhance it. (Hutto, 2008, p.241)

Hutto's definition of narrative nature as a socially justified practice created the grounds for researchers to redefine *narrative intentionality* as preceding the human narrative capacity. As Herman pointed out, "[...] intentional systems are grounded in storytelling practices" (Herman, 2008, p.240), but the narrative as a cognitive frame provides the intentional coloring, modulating Folk Psychology and Theory of Mind in the prime order. This denotes the shift from inner intention to the outer domain, reopening the door to empathy, intentionality, and universality of narrative as a form of human interaction. Attempts to find universal narrative qualities connected with empathetic feelings will lead to cognitive linguistics, proposing some universal scripts and scenarios embedded into the fabric of the narrative and "activated" by each individual in the course of mental simulation. Though the cognitive interpretation of empathy in respect to narrative turns it into a problematic issue, one cannot but see the powerful effect of empathetic reaction when it comes to character identification. Nevertheless, as a result of empathy, some round characters can change their characteristics as seen by the reader from negative into positive, demonstrating the dependable nature of emotional feedback aroused by the empathetic reaction. As Keen rightly warns, there is still little empirical data to state a stable link between empathetic reactions and real actions. She writes:

The link between feeling with fictional characters and acting on behalf of real people, I have argued, is extremely tenuous and has yet to be substantiated either through empirical research into the effects of reading or through analysis of demonstrable causal relationships between novel reading as a cultural phenomenon and historical changes in societies in which novel reading flourishes. (Keen, 2007)

Pointing at causal relations within the novel, Keen underlines the importance of the contextual surrounding of the narrative. Since the notions of *cause and purpose* are the starting points in intentionality research, empathy plays the role of a mediator between the two of them, bringing the process of *narrative perception* into focus. As it was stated above, the process of text reading is viewed here as a continuous semiosis, as the interpretation of one sign through another (Krampen et al., 1987) as a certain semiosis of Umwelten limited by subjective boundaries. In terms of biosemiotic theory, the substitution of the word "interpretation" for the notion of "translation" will be more reasonable (Eko, 1986, p.183), as the "birth" of new meaning is observed only when the reader's self-referential system meets the requirements of functional differentiation (Hoffmeyer, 1999) of other-referencing the narrative, fulfilling through this a minimum requirement for Umwelt.

Jacob von Uexkull's distinction between perceptual and operational categories of signs makes it possible for a compound sign to become a whole sign (cited in Kull, 2002), on condition that several perceptual categories converge into one operational category, as a sort of sensor-motor automatic reaction. This sensor-motor categorisation is interpreted as the human ability to react to a certain factor of surrounding by recognition of individuality, as proposed by Gerald Edelman (Edelman and Tononi, 2000). In a similar form, it is represented in Jakob von Uexkull's notion of two signs: *Merkzeichen* and *Wirkzeichen* (cited in Kull, 2002) and can be classified as *subjectively embedded meaning* derived from the cooperation of these two types of signs. Further, this dialogical communication has been put into the basis of Peircian triadic

model of sign in the notion of subjectivity, i.e. “it denotes a property of being what Descartes himself called a ‘thinking entity’” (Wu, 2015, p.74).

In his definition of semiosis, Peirce underlines the inherent dynamicity and dialogicity of signs, making them the agents themselves, unlike the author and the recipient, who are also the signs (Sonnenhauser, 2008). Developing his argument further, Peirce recognises the sign nature of human experience as well, saying that it seeks its realisation in human’s external reaction to the facts of the world in a form of habit. This habit, according to Sonnenhauser (2008), helps to establish sign-object relation typical for linguistic signs (p.327). Peircian understanding of interpretation goes far beyond the level of the linguistic signs. According to Peirce it stretches to include all of life itself and is performed as a form of reasoning.

To put it plainly, the human need to recognise symbols is mediated through argumentation (a certain type of reasoning, which incorporates deduction and induction) and hypothesizing (in a form of abduction, provoking pluralistic hypotheses in the process of sign interpretation). The number of hypotheses and their actualisation (i.e. proof) is limited by the *habit* of experience, calling for such expectations. Peirce writes about this sign dialogicity as follows:

[W]e note as highly characteristic, that signs mostly function each between two minds or theatres of consciousness, of which the one is the agent that utters the sign, (whether acoustically, optically, or otherwise), while the other is the patient mind that interprets the sign... Before the sign was uttered, it already was virtually present to the consciousness of the utterer, in the form of a thought. [...]. Likewise, after a sign has been interpreted, it will virtually remain in the consciousness of its interpreter, where it will be a sign ... and, as a sign should in its turn have an interpreter, and so forward. (Peirce, 1967, p.318)

What is described here by Peirce has the following implications for narrative analysis: (1) the role of the author and the interpretant in sign process correlates with the agency of signs; (2) the agency of signs appears as the result of differentiation and further abductive reasoning, provoked by the prognostic function of the human to interpret the signs; (3) the well for multiple hypotheses lies in the human experience, also represented by signs; (4) in the process of interpretation the final interpretant (the habit) sets the limits for semiosis, based on the level of probability of the inferences suggested by individual experience; (5) sign ability for self-referencing and self-interpretation gives birth to the emergence of communicative agents, and a narrative text can be considered an autopoietic teleological system (moving from cause to purpose) (Alexander, 2009). The dynamics of the autopoietic system are stimulated, in turn, by constant self-inference of individual experience in an attempt to comprehend the life position of the character. By doing so, the narrative keeps the reader involved in the intrigue of the text, provoking at the same time empathetic feelings (see more about empathy in the novel in Keen, 2007).

Therefore, subjectivity as outlined here connects the two aspects of a sign: *internal* (the sign itself) and *external* (manifesting experience and environment), on the intersections of which the new meaning arises, prompted by personal experience of the reader/perceiver/interpreter. The inherent character of the fictional narrative in this respect is closely linked to the human perception of the world (as it was mentioned earlier, the human narratological ability is embedded in our life practices (see Hutto, 2008). Much earlier, the same statement was suggested by Paul Ricoeur (1980) from the positions of phenomenological hermeneutics. Saying that intrigue of the narrative serves as a way of simulating a real personal experience, Ricoeur considers it to be based on our “pre-understanding of the world” cognitive patterns (Ricoeur, 1980, p.169). Putting it into the semiotic domain, the intrigue as a structural element helps to bridge the dual temporality of the narrative by connecting two aspects of the sign: internal and external. At the same time, intrigue is considered by Ricoeur to be a kind of

configuration, helping to re-structure/re-construct seemingly non-motivated events into a meaningful storyline within a narrative (Ricoeur, 1980, p.180). The paradox of time, which Ricoeur calls the double temporality of the narrative, is resolved mainly due to the reader's ability of reconfiguration governed by the expectation for confirmation of his hypothesis at the end of the narrative story. Thus, this teleological and intentional phenomenon of goal setting originates from the sign interpretation and, being re-produced by the interpreter, constitutes the very essence of the emergency of the narrative, both in reality and fiction.

Conclusion

Giving credit to the findings of the structuralist narratology, this paper widens a problematic scope of research from the textual features of narrative to its hermeneutic and phenomenological interpretation in the context of the global semiotic approach. The pre-condition for choosing such an approach was Roland Barthes' thesis about the ubiquitous character of the narrative, and Paul Ricoeur's theory of narrative temporality and mimesis, which might help to solve the paradox of dual time representation in the narrative. As the classical narratology in all its branches strives to uncover the relationship between the meaning of signs and their interpretation, the position of global semiotics shifts the focus of attention from the textual level to the subjective one, seeing it as a continuous semiosis between biotic and abiotic species. This reference of global semiotics to biology caused the formation of a new science, biosemiotics, with a wider focus of scientific study on sign systems, which might serve as the fundamental basis for studying manifestations of subjectivity in living and abiotic systems, like fictional narration. As Jesper Hoffmeyer (2008) points out: "This investigation into the semiotic nature of living systems has taken a long time to emerge, since it poses a challenge to many of the prevailing ontological assumptions of both the natural and the human sciences" (p.3). The narrative plays an important role in world modeling by an organism, as it is deeply embedded in the human experience via cognition and knowledge storing. It links the axiological and epistemological potential of narrative with the semiotic modeling in its reference to human experience (i.e. memory) on the one hand and puts the ground for considering subjectivity a central category in linguistic studies of narrativity, on the other (Research Question #1). Subjectivity in its turn rests on/arises from the interrelation between the signs, where the central role is played by the interpretant (see Peirce's triadic sign model), which is in constant dialogical relation with the object. Moving from the cause to purpose on the way to meaning making, from one sign to another, subjectivity acquires intentionality, stimulated by the reader's reasoning (from the argument, abduction to the deduction), applied to narrative intrigue. The mimetic nature of the narrative (Paul Ricoeur) calls for active participation of the reader in the process of restructuring a seemingly linear storyline of events and re-figuring it into a new meaningful entity (i.e. configuration) (Research Question #2). Subjectivity has been stated in this paper as a central category of narrative analysis, which allows for the combination of structuralist, hermeneutic, phenomenological, and semiotic approaches to narrative into interdisciplinary research (Research Question #3). At the same time, more scientific efforts are needed to overcome the terminological ambiguity and methodological complexity of global semiotics in literary studies of fiction and non-fiction narratives, as well as of avant-garde multimodal narrative, which was intentionally avoided here due to the limited scope of the paper. All this may provide new perspectives for further research on narrative discourse's emergent nature in the context of global semiotics, as this focus of research may lead to re-interpretation of basic problems of the aesthetics and the essence of catharsis per se.

Reference List

- Alexander, V. N. (2009). The poetics of purpose. *Biosemiotics*, 2, 77–100.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12304-008-9031-3>
- Andreeva, V. A. (2006). Event in fictional text. *Yzvestyia Rossyiskoho hosudarstvennoho pedahohycheskoho unyversyteta ym. A.Y. Hertseny*, 7, 21(1), 44–56.
- Andreeva, V.A. (2007). Literary narrative: text and discourse. *Izvestia: Herzen University Journal of Humanities & Sciences*, 46, 61–74.
- Barbieri, M. (2001). *The organic codes: The birth of semantic biology*. PeQuod.
- Cobley, P. (2008) Communication: definitions and concepts. *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405186407.wbiecc071>
- Cobley, P. (2013). What is narrative? *Narrative* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203494929>
- Emmeche, C. (1998). Defining life as a semiotic phenomenon. *Cybernetics and Human Knowing*, 5(1), 3–17.
- Emmeche, C. (2000). Closure, function, emergence, semiosis, and life: the same idea? Reflections on the concrete and the abstract in theoretical biology. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 901, 187–197.
- Genette, G. ([1972] 1980). *Narrative discourse: an essay in method*. (J. E. Lewin, Trans.) Cornell University Press.
- Gervas, P; Lönneker-Rodman, B.; Meister, J., C; Peinado, F. (2006). Narrative models: narratology meets artificial intelligence. In *Proceedings of Satellite workshop: Toward Computational Models of Literary Analysis, 5th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*. (pp.44–51). European Language Association Offices.
- Greimas, A. J. (1976). *Sémiotique et sciences sociales*. Seuil.
- Lotman, Y. M., Clark, W., Grishakova, M. (2009). *Culture and explosion*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Edelman, G., M., and Tononi, G. (2000). *A universe of consciousness: How matter becomes imagination*. Basic Books.
- Eko, U. (1988). Zametky na poliakh “Ymeny rozy”. *Ynostrannaia lyteratura*, 10, 88–104.
- Hamburger, K. ([1957] 1993). *The logic of literature*. (2nd ed.), (M. J. Rose, Trans.) Indiana University Press.
- Herman, D. (2009). *Basic elements of narrative*.
https://books.google.com/books/about/Basic_Elements_of_Narrative
- Herman, D. (2008). Narrative theory and the intentional stance. *Partial Answers*, 6(2), 233–260.
- Hoffmeyer, J. (2008). *Biosemiotics: an examination into the signs of life and the life of signs*. Scranton University Press.
- Hoffmeyer, J. (1999). The vague boundaries of life. (E. Taborsky, Ed.) *Semiosis, Evolution, Energy: Towards a Reconceptualization of the Sign*. (pp.151–169). Shaker Verlag.
- Hutto, D. D. (2008). *Folk psychological narratives: the sociocultural basis of understanding reasons*. MIT Press.
- Keen, S. (2007). *Empathy and the novel*. Oxford University Press.
- Krampen, M.; Oehler, K.; Posner, R.; Sebeok, T.; Uexküll, T. von. (1987). *Classics of semiotics*. Plenum Press.

- Kull, K. (2002). A sign is not alive – a text is. *Sign Systems Studies*, 30(1), 327–336. <https://doi.org/10.12697/SSS.2002.30.1.21>
- Kull, K.; Emmeche, C.; Hoffmeyer, J. (2011). Why biosemiotics? An introduction to our view on the biology of life itself. In C. Emmeche & K. Kull (Eds.) *Towards a semiotic biology: life is the action of signs*. (pp. 1–21). Imperial College Press. https://doi.org/10.1142/9781848166882_0001
- Linde, C. (1993). *Life stories: The creation of coherence*. Oxford University Press.
- Livytska, I. A. (2019). The art of narration and artificial narrative intelligence: implications for interdisciplinary research. *Journal of Narrative and Language Studies*, 7(13), 309–18. <https://www.nalans.com/index.php/nalans/article/view/197>
- Lotman, M. (2002). Umwelt and semiosphere. *Sign Systems Studies*, 30(1), 33–40.
- Peirce, C. S. (1967). Manuscripts in the Houghton Library of Harvard University, as identified by R. Robin. *Annotated Catalogue of the Papers of Charles S. Peirce*. University of Massachusetts Press.
- Propp, V. ([1928] 1968). *Morphology of the folktale*. Indiana UP.
- Ricoeur, P. (1980). Narrative time. *Critical Inquiry*, 7(1), 169–190. https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/294512/mod_resource/content/1/1980%20Ricoeur-1.pdf
- Rimmon-Kenan, S. ([1983] 2002). *Narrative fiction: Contemporary poetics*, (2nd ed.), Routledge.
- Sausurre, F.de. ([1916] 1959). *Course in general linguistics*. (C. Bally, A. Sechehaye, A. Riedlinger, Eds.), W. Baskin, Trans.). The Philosophical Library. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/cb41/a70d25abce8718dd680894c8c68edfb3ffe5.pdf>
- Searle, J. (1983). *Intentionality: an essay in the philosophy of mind*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173452>
- Searle, J. (2010). *Making the social world: The structure of human civilization*. Oxford University Press.
- Searle, J. (1977). Reiterating the differences: a reply to Derrida, *Glyph*, 1, 198–208. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sebeok, T. A. (2001). *Global semiotics*. Indiana University Press.
- Sonnenhauser, B. (2008). On the linguistic expression of subjectivity: towards a sign-centered approach. *Semiotica*, 172, 1(4), 323–337. <https://doi.org/10.1515/SEMI.2008.102>
- Wu, J. (2015). Studies of subjectivity in language. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 10(3), 73–76. <https://doi.org/10.3968/6702>