

**UNIVERSITATEA „AUREL VLAICU”, ARAD
FACULTATEA DE ȘTIINȚE UMANISTE ȘI SOCIALE
STUDII DOCTORALE: FILOLOGIE**

**TEZĂ DE DOCTORAT
REZUMAT**

**Coordonator științific:
prof. univ. dr. Ionel Funeriu**

Doctorand: Diana Achim

**ARAD
2016**

**UNIVERSITATEA „AUREL VLAICU”, ARAD
FACULTATEA DE ȘTIINȚE UMANISTE ȘI SOCIALE
STUDII DOCTORALE: FILOLOGIE**

**STANCES OF THE NARRATEE
IN THE NARRATIVE LITERARY DISCOURSE**

**Coordonator științific:
prof. univ. dr. Ionel Funeriu**

Doctorand: Diana Achim

**ARAD
2016**

Contents

Argument	2
Chapter I: The History of the Narratee	7
1. 30 years of theory.....	8
2. Acceptations of the term "narratee".....	83
Chapter II: The Narratee Theory	95
1. What the narratee is.....	95
2. What the narratee is not. Possible misunderstandings.....	103
3. Functions of the narratee.....	105
4. Stances of the narratee. Working definitions.....	110
Chapter III: Reading the narratee	130
1. Stances of the narratee in <i>Ancuța's Inn</i> by Mihail Sadoveanu.....	133
2. Stances of the narratee in <i>Procurst's Bed</i> by Camil Petrescu.....	153
3. Stances of the narratee in <i>Old-Court Phillanderers</i> by Mateiu Caragiale.....	170
4. Stances of the narratee in <i>The Woman in Red</i> by Mircea Nedelciu, Adriana Babeți, Mircea Mihăeș.....	186
Conclusion	244
Annex	247
Bibliography	296

Précis

*However, literature as well means this: to cut in order to understand.*¹

The issue of the narratee – fictitious stance of the literary narrative discourse – has been less studied by theorists of literature. More specifically, it is approached tangentially, due to the necessity of keeping the symmetry of the instances considered important – author, narrator, character, reader – with all their stances. Especially in later years, the narratee has benefitted from a few interesting and scientifically proven studies, which have not succeeded in correcting and compensating for the neglect of this instance throughout the long history of literary theories, theories which approach, in a subtle and polemic manner, all the other aspects of the literary discourse. I became aware of this loophole when, going through literature in narratology and related areas, I was surprised that while other instances of narrative communication are rigorously addressed, the narratee is not given due attention. In terms of research, it is understood that the issue of the narratee concerned me even more as it was a less explored territory.

The study of the narratee is an interesting exercise of reading a literary work “upside down”. The privileged position of the narrator, who owns the word and produces the discourse, draws the attention of any concrete reader. The characters that do the action are another important point of interest and the author, the creator of the work, arouses the reader’s curiosity. Moreover, the new reception theories have also revealed the importance of the reader in constructing the meaning of the literary work. In this context of the literary discourse theory, the narratee bears resemblance to Cinderella. Overshadowed, it supports through its functions the complicated mechanism of conveying the message from the narrator to the concrete reader, it mediates, filters, connects the unseen threads of story and discourse, it is attentive, receptive, active because, metaphorically speaking, the glass slipper of the story told by the narrator fits only the narratee. As an act of communication, the literary narrative discourse is inconceivable in the absence of the narratee, because the narrator always addresses someone, either discreetly or directly.

¹ Mircea Nedelciu, Adriana Babeți, Mircea Mihăeș, *Femeia în roșu*, prefață de Mircea Cărtărescu, Ediția a III-a, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2003, p. 436.

A very important aspect related to the study of all the stances of the narrative literary discourse and, implicitly, those of the narratee, is the correct understanding of the discourse construction of literary work, and hence their proper interpretation. An expert interpretation cannot ignore the mechanism underlying the production of the literary text, the specificity of artistic communication, which is more complex than any other form of communication. An essential part of this mechanism is the narratee, because any speech is influenced by its recipient and by the communication context. The narratee provides the adjustment necessary for the transmission of the message of the literary work, because the act of enunciation aims to persuade, to thrill, to impress the recipient and it is precisely this effect that is fundamental in literature.

Beyond the objective reasons that I mentioned above, there is a subjective reason why I chose to investigate the stances of the narratee. My reading preferences are within the narrative prose. This research helps me become a much better reader.

Results of previous research on the chosen topic are brought together in the first chapter of my paper, **The History of the Narratee**. In the first section of this chapter, **30 years of theory**, I presented a history of theoretical approaches to the issue of the narratee as fictional stance of the narrative literary discourse. I sketched the theoretical context to which the issue of the narratee belongs, the premises of the emergence of this concept, as well as its development and avatars, to the present when it has become the subject of interesting research in narratology. I selected the authors and works that are presented here according to their relevance to the theme of my research. Obviously, I have not covered the entire field, so fecund, of narratology. The relevance of these theories and their authors also depends on personal preference or access to bibliography. However, I chose important names: Booth, Eco, Austin, Ricœur, Genette, Barthes, Todorov, Ohmann, Searle, Bremond, Iser, Lintvelt, Bal, Thomas and their works of reference in order of their publication. The chronological criterion allowed me, on the one hand, to correctly organize the theoretical material, and on the other hand it offered me a revelatory vision of the evolution of the concept of narratee.

Thus, Booth in his *Rhetoric of Fiction*², introduces the term *implied author*, this duplicate of the concrete author, found on transmission end, which highlights an until then unexplored layer of narrative communication, of the “encounter” of author and reader in the literary work. Umberto Eco’s concept is presented in evolution in three representative

² Wayne C. Booth, *Retorica romanului*, traducere de Alina Clej și Ștefan Stoenescu, București, Editura Univers, 1976.

works: *The Open Work*³, *Lector in fabula*⁴ and *The Limits of Interpretation*⁵. Eco's first work has the great merit of having overturned the acknowledged perception on the artwork, making a breach in the idea that work is a finite unit, intrinsically valuable, intangible, impenetrable, only to be contemplated. The reception takes on an important role in creation. In the second paper which I took into consideration, the Italian theorist assumes that the text is "a lazy machine" that requires active involvement from the reader to fill the "blank" spaces. Eco's third work presented in my thesis raises the question of textual strategies involved in artistic communication, of internal articulations of narrative communication, of textual thresholds and levels, both at the transmission and the reception end. Terms such as *model author* and *model reader* occur as intermediary narrative stances, located on the route of narrative literary communication, with distinct functions in filtering or processing the artistic message.

I also presented the conception of J.L. Austin synthesized in his best known work, *How to do things with words*⁶. The discovery of performative utterances and the theory of illocutionary acts has generated a range of reactions and opened a new research field, making it possible to develop the theory known as speech act theory.

Paul Ricœur⁷ is another theorist that I considered important for the subject of my research. At the level of discourse, Ricœur stresses the dialogic feature, specific to the communication situation updated by any enunciation, which requires an interlocutor. While Booth postulated an *alter-ego* of the author, in Ricœur's view there is an *alter-ego* of the reader.

Gérard Genette in *Figures*⁸, resorts to the metaphor of Möbius' ring, which is revealing for understanding that the literary text is born out of the dynamic forces involved in transmission and those involved in reception, this *va-et-vient* establishing an impression of life, of permanent motion. The question arisen here for the first time is that of identifying the linguistic marks of the recipient of the narrative discourse, which is performed by analyzing the narrator's discourse. At the same time, we find here grounds to

³ Umberto Eco, *Opera deschisă. Formă și indeterminare în poeziile contemporane*, Ediția a II-a, traducere și prefață de Cornel Mihai Ionescu, Pitești București, Editura Paralela 45, 2002.

⁴ Umberto Eco, *Lector in fabula. Cooperarea interpretativă în textele narative*, în românește de Marina Spalas, prefață de Cornel Mihai Ionescu, Editura Univers, București, 1991.

⁵ Umberto Eco, *Limitele interpretării*, traducere de Ștefania Mincu și Daniela Bucșă, Editura Pontica, Constanța, 1996.

⁶ J.L. Austin, *Cum să faci lucruri cu vorbe*, traducere din limba engleză de Sorana Corneanu, prefață de Vlad Alexandrescu, Editura Paralela 45, Pitești, 2005.

⁷ Paul Ricœur, *Eseuri de hermeneutică*, traducere de Vasile Tonoiu, București, Editura Humanitas, 1995.

⁸ Toate referirile din această secțiune au în vedere volumul Gérard Genette, *Figuri*, selecție, traducere și prefață de Angela Ioan și Irina Mavrodin, București, Editura Univers, 1978.

a typology of the narratee, based on criteria embedded in the stance of the narrator profile. Also, in *Introduction to Arhitekt. Fiction and diction*⁹, Genette takes an important step in clarifying the relations between the stances of narrative communication, especially in that he distinguishes between levels of text, with an emphasis on enunciating speech, but also mentions the issue of the recipient of the narrative discourse.

Roland Barthes, in *Poétique du récit*¹⁰, believes that reading is the one that disambiguates the symbolic code of the literary work, but at the same time contributes to its construction, without affecting its uniqueness or originality in any way.

Tzvetan Todorov in *Poetics. The Grammar of the Decameron*¹¹, says that the reader gives relief and value to the text and through reading participates in enhancing the internal aesthetic dimensions embedded and prescribed by the author. When Todorov talks about vision, he introduces the idea of perception within the work, which, in my opinion, is compatible with the general notion of narratee. Richard Ohmann¹² refers to the concept of the *ideal reader*, when it had been recently introduced by Eco, a sign that it is an issue that concerns literary theorists increasingly more. On the other hand, John R. Searle¹³, in the study which I have chosen as relevant for my research, reconciles Booth's idea about the responsibility of the sender in novelistic cooperation by choosing the most appropriate rhetoric, with the idea that the listener must recognize the illocutionary effect (or purpose) intended by the speaker to understand speech acts.

*La Logique du récit*¹⁴, Claude Bremond's book demonstrates that, by producing his/her discourse, the narrator has certain intentions, performs certain actions on his/her audience. As for the definition of the narratee, which appears as the *recipient* or *listener*, I found in Bremond views that hold with the direction opened by Gerald Prince.

⁹ Gérard Genette, *Introducere în arhitekt. Ficțiune și dicțiune*, traducere și prefață de Ion Pop, Editura Univers, București, 1994.

¹⁰ Roland Barthes, *Romanul scriiturii*, antologie, selecție de texte și traducere Adriana Babeți și Delia Șepețean-Vasiliu, prefață de Adriana Babeți, postfață de Delia Șepețean-Vasiliu, Editura Univers, București, 1987.

¹¹ Tzvetan Todorov, *Poetica. Gramatica Decameronului*, traducere și studiu introductiv de Paul Miclău, Editura Univers, București, 1975.

¹² Richard Ohmann în *Poetica americană. Orientări actuale*. Studii critice, antologie, note și bibliografie de Mircea Borcilă și Richard McLain, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 1981.

¹³ John R. Searle în *Poetica americană. Orientări actuale*. Studii critice, antologie, note și bibliografie de Mircea Borcilă și Richard McLain, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 1981.

¹⁴ Claude Bremond, *Logica povestirii*, traducere de Micaela Slăvescu, prefață și note de Ioan Pânzaru, București, Editura Univers, 1981.

In *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*¹⁵ Wolfgang Iser claims that the literary work is not the text as it was created by the author nor its updating claimed through the process of reading, but a virtual intermediary space, where the rules of the literary work guarantee the freedom of reception. The literary work is the area where the way in which it acquires meaning is noticed and imagined by the reader, an area which is beyond the language of the work and the language of the reader at the same time.

In *Essay on narrative typology: the Point of View*¹⁶, Jaap Lintvelt starts by developing a communicative – pragmatic model of the narrative literary text, in which there are clear distinctions between the stances of narrative communication so often mistaken elsewhere. Based on the functional opposition between narrator and actor, he deductively establishes five narrative types provided with specific features and illustrated with concrete examples. Lintvelt summarizes the concepts of narratology, providing to the interested the criteria, benchmarks and schemes of his predecessors, marking the original elements or points of convergence. He believes that the concept of narratee should be generally accepted, to highlight through the name itself that it is the narrator's pair, the recipient targeted by the latter, but also to avoid confusion caused by the use of other terms.

Speaking about novelistic cooperation, Radu Toma¹⁷ shows that in the age of Enlightenment cooperation is refused for several reasons related to the episteme and ideology, literature being considered a field of the futile. According to the Romanian theorist, the “unfortunate” conditions of the novelistic communication in the eighteenth century determined actions that the speaker must undertake to establish, however, a situation of communication, of cooperation. In this regard, the author demonstrates that the consequence is the “explosion” of both the I and YOU stances and of the diegesis.

Another important work presented by me is that of Mieke Bal, *Narratology. Introduction to the theory of narrative*.¹⁸ The issue of the narrative discourse strategy is treated as a way to influence the external and internal reception of the “content” of the text, in this regard, the author considering that the focus is the most powerful and subtle means of manipulation due to the effect of identification thus produced.

¹⁵Wolfgang Iser, *Actul lecturii: o teorie a efectului estetic*, traducere din limba germană, note și prefață de Romanița Constantinescu, Editura Paralela 45, Pitești, 2006.

¹⁶Jaap Lintvelt, *Încercare de tipologie narativă. Punctul de vedere*, traducere de Angela Martin, studiu introductiv de Mircea Martin, Editura Univers, București, 1994.

¹⁷Radu Toma, *Epistemă, ideologie, roman: secolul XVIII francez*, Editura Univers, București, 1982.

¹⁸Mieke Bal, *Naratologia. Introducere în teoria narațiunii*, Ediția a II-a, traducere de Sorin Pârnu, cuvânt înainte de Monica Botez, Institutul European, Iași, 2008.

In the second section of this chapter, **Acceptations of the term "narratee"**, I presented the first theorist who proposed the systematic study of the narratee. It is Gerald Prince¹⁹ who defines the most important tools in the analysis of the narratee in the narrative literary discourse, lays the theoretical basis of the study of the narratee, suggests its classification criteria, defines its functions, identifies the linguistic marks that show the presence of the narratee in the discourse. The presentation of Prince's conception is complemented by that of Gérard Genette²⁰, and Mary Ann Piwowarczyk²¹ as well as by examples I propose from Romanian literary works (prose by Mihai Eminescu, Sadoveanu, Mateiu Caragiale, Camil Petrescu). In addition, I refer to other definitions that Prince formulates in his dictionary of narratology²², which value the concept of narratee whose introduction stresses its importance in narrative communication.

After I realised that in previous research there are a number of ambiguities, misinterpretations, gaps or inconsistencies in the definition of the narratee, I decided to clear them up in the second chapter, **The Narratee Theory**, where I presented my own conception of that stance of the narrative discourse. My approach had a few guidelines: **1. What the narratee is, 2. What the narratee is not. Possible misunderstandings, 3. Functions of the narratee and 4. Stances of the narratee. Working definitions.** In the first section I formulated seven definitions of the narratee which I supported with explanations. They rely on the specialty literature I have read, on synthesizing several theories, but also on my own observations. I started my theoretical approach from the idea that the narratee is unique for every narrative discourse; it has/is an unmistakable fingerprint. Unlike the narrator, the narratee is delegated twice. On the one hand, it is postulated by the discourse, embedded at the time of its production and updated with the reading. On the other hand, it is the area of intervention of the concrete reader, the place where the latter can step inside the discourse. Since the stance of the concrete reader is variable, because a text, once published, can be read by an infinite number of real readers, the stance of the narratee becomes relative, it becomes unstable. Hence the difficulty of comprising it into a definition. Identifying the profile of this stance of the discourse requires deep understanding of the fabric of the text, but there is also subjective side to it, because the narratee of a text comes into being, acquires a shape while it comes in contact

¹⁹ Gerald Prince, *Introduction à l'étude du narrataire*, „Poétique”, nr. 14, 1973, pp. 178-196.

²⁰ Gérard Genette, *Figures III*, collection Poétique, aux Éditions du Seuil, Paris, 1972, pp. 265-267.

²¹ Mary Ann Piwowarczyk, *The narratee and the situation of enunciation: A reconstitution of Prince's theory*, „Genre”, 9, 1976, p. 161.

²² Gerald Prince, *Dictionar de naratologie*, traducere de Sorin Pârnu, Institutul European, Iași, 2004.

with the concrete reader. However, the narratee may be subject to a classification according to invariable criteria, making its identification possible, setting a profile specific for the discourse analysed and, finally, it can contribute to original interpretations of the literary work, because, ultimately, this is the gain of a narratological analysis. Given that the narratee is a construct of the narrator, the former is fictional. Unlike the narrator, which is easily detectable from the beginning because it speaks, the narratee bears definitions of approximation, because it calls for a concerted effort to discover it in the discourse and to rebuild it according to the concrete reader who is unpredictable, a variable coordinate.

So, I defined the narratee as an area of intervention in the discourse (Definition 1). In the construction of the discourse, the narratee is partly controlled by the narrator that makes it possible as a virtual dialog offer for its addressee. Only in this way can the concrete reader penetrate and collaborate from within to the unfolding of the discourse. Then I considered that the narratee is an inside – outside articulation. (Definition 2). Like a stage, the narratee updates the text, being a space of unfolding and passage between the extratextual (the concrete reality of the public with a specific cultural profile) and the intradiscursive (the fiction constructed by the discourse). Like any articulation, the narratee must work to make the mechanism of the text operate in relation with the world in which it is updated. I considered the narratee to be the out – in – out movement (Definition 3) capitalizing the metaphor of Möbius' ring proposed by Genette²³. Then the narratee is a double subjectivity (Definition 4). Being delegated twice, both by the author, through the narrator and by the reader, the narratee has an unstable shape, its peculiarities depending on the one hand, on the one who delegates it from the transmission end, and on the other hand, on the subjectivity of the reader, who “lives” in it as long as the latter reads the literary work. The narratee is, as I demonstrated, the receiver and the recipient of the discourse (Definition 5). It is an internal receiver of the narrative discourse, and, according to the narrative situation, it may be the intended recipient of the discourse or not. The narratee is a fictitious position of the reader in the text (Definition 6), since the instances of this stance ensure the entrance into the text of the concrete reader under the form allowed by the narrative discourse. Finally, the narratee is a mediator (Definition 7), ensuring and maintaining communication between the inside of the discourse and outside of the text, allowing the reader to relate to the narrated world.

²³ Gérard Genette, *Figuri*, selecție, traducere și prefață de Angela Ioan și Irina Mavrodin, Editura Univers, București, 1978, p.138.

In the second section I brought arguments for the distinctions to be made between the narratee and other stances of narrative discourse that it could be mistaken for: the concrete reader, the abstract reader or actor.

In the third section, I drew from definitions the functions of the narratee and I explained them, illustrating them with examples from various texts of Romanian literature. Thus, I referred to children's literature (Cezar Petrescu), literature subservient to communism (Eugen Mihăescu), Enlightenment literature (Ion Budai-Deleanu), avant-garde literature (Tristan Tzara), in order to demonstrate that regardless of age, the narratee has the function to ensure the author – reader agreement, which does not have to be perfect, but must fulfill a more important role: to ensure the dynamic of the text.

In Section **4. Stances of the narratee. Working definitions** I have carried out a text analysis to demonstrate practically how the correct identification of the narratee functions in interpreting literary texts, using as support a narrative prose fragment belonging to Mihai Eminescu. First, I determined the zero degree narratee, an intrinsic stance of any narrative literary discourse, a receptacle of discourse memory. Thus, I have shown that the zero degree narratee has information related to the proper meaning of words, masters grammar perfectly, reasons, knows the primary rules of building a story and has memory. Then I analyzed the text in terms of three types of readers – competent, medium and innocent. The analysis consisted in exercising the skills of the concrete reader: summarizing the text, placing it in a cultural context, identifying the formal conventions of the text, style analysis of the text, interpretation of the text. Next I determined the specific narratee demonstrating that the definitions I have formulated work. The zero degree narratee can be determined in any narrative discourse, being a passive stance, but belonging to the existence of the discourse. Also, the specific narratee was identified as deviation from the zero degree of the narratee or as a place of intervention of the three types of readers. Further, I proposed a typology of the narratee based on theories expounded in previous sections and my own observations.

From the perspective of my research, I identified, besides the zero degree narratee, two broad categories of narratees, determined by the relation with the diegesis: the extradiegetic and the intradiegetic narratee. Both the extradiegetic and the intradiegetic narratee may have two stances: the explicit and the implicit narratee. The explicit narratee may have, in its turn, two stances: the declared and the undeclared narratee. Besides the typology of the narratees I gave examples from various literary works and, finally, I made a schematic representation of the categories of narratees that I had defined.

The main objectives of my research were to validate the narratee stances that I proposed and to demonstrate that the correct identification of the narratee specific to each narrative literary discourse adds to the comprehension of the global meaning of the work, complementing the interpretations acknowledged by literary criticism.

In this respect, in the third chapter, **Reading the narratee**, I put into practice the concepts defined above for discourse analysis. My analytical approach has four parts, delimited by four literary works whose narrator – narratee relationship is analysed and where the stances of the narratee are identified: **Stances of the narratee** in *Ancuta's Inn* by **Sadoveanu**; **Stances of the narratee** in *Procrust's Bed* by **Camil Petrescu**; **Stances of the narratee** in *Old-Court Phillanderers* by **Mateiu Caragiale** and **Stances of the narratee** in *The Woman in Red* by **Mircea Nedelciu, Adriana Babeți and Mircea Mihăeș**. Each of the four parts contains a comprehensive analysis of the narrative discourse and of the consequences at the level of significance, of identifying the stances of the narratee.

As a research method I chose to analyse important parts of the texts as well as a global analysis of the texts, in terms of narrative. After identifying the linguistic marks of the narratee's presence in the narrative discourse, I used three questions to guide my analytical approach: *who tells the story?* - to identify the narrator, *who is the story told to?* – to identify the narratee, *what is the purpose of telling the story?* – a question whose answer regulates the narrator – narratee relationship and the stances of the narratee.

For the demonstration I chose authentic texts in Romanian literature, although there was the temptation of world literature, but translations, as you know, can be inexact. Because narratological analysis and detecting the linguistic marks of the narratee involve paying attention to all details of the discourse, I decided to stop at what I can understand best: Romanian. Also, the selected works are representative of their authors and Romanian literature. The discourse of great literature was a serious challenge, because there is already an acknowledged critical reception, so I took a chance to add something where there seems little left to say. Of course, text selection also took into account the relevance of the works to my area of interest. Support texts are dynamic from the perspective of the narrator and the narratee stances and additionally activate a “meta”²⁴, function, all having a discourse about the discourse.

²⁴ Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu, Cristina Călărășu, Liliana Ionescu Ruxândoiu, Mihaela Mancaș, Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, *Dicționar de științe ale limbii*, Editura Nemira, București, 2001, p. 310.

For the first three of the four chosen literary works, the analysis of important excerpts can be found in the **Annex**, a kind of internal kitchen for understanding the relationship between the stances of the narrative communication. For the novel *The Woman in Red* by Mircea Nedelciu, Adriana Babeți, Mircea Mihăeș I just made a global analysis, given the specific construction of this unique novel.

At the end of my research I found that the analysis of the chosen literary texts validated the definitions given to the narratee, the functions of this narrative stance, but, especially, added a unique perspective to what had already been said in the acknowledged critical discourse. In other words, as I had wished, the narratological operation did not become an autopsy on the body of literature “chopped” by the instruments of theory, but it enriched with meaning the life of literary work.

Therefore, I finally formulated the **Conclusions** and opportunities for future research, with the awareness that my approach has not exhausted the subject of the stances of the narratee, but only attracts attention to an area less researched by narratology and proposes a moment of reflection on the theoretical tools offered by the approach of the narrative literary discourse.

The specific narratee, that unique impression of the narrative literary text is a stance which, according to the reading skills of the concrete reader, becomes visible or not. For the innocent reader, the narratee does not exist, because the former has the ability to identify with the latter, to step inside the story through it. The more innocent the reader, the more blurred the stance of the narratee, because the naïve reader believes that he/she is addressed by the narrative voice. The competent reader becomes aware of the mechanism responsible for the production – reception of discourse and his/her distance from the diegesis is given by the perception of this space represented by narratee. For the competent reader taking distance from the mechanism responsible for text creation and identifying discursive strategy leads to understanding the meaning of the work. So, the narratee is the stance that regulates the proper reception of the work, according to each reader: for the innocent one, the narratee ensures integration in the story, inside participation in the events narrated, while for the competent reader, the narratee ensures understanding of the meaning of the work.

A particular case of narrative communication is that of the postmodern literary discourse, in which, as I have shown, the narratee is an *avatar*, although its stances are the same and can be determined with the same tools of analysis. As in the virtual environment, the avatar is a graphic image whose exterior features are variable, being an iconic

personification of a user entering virtual reality, so the narratee permanently changes appearance with the flexibility required by the dynamic of the postmodern literary discourse.

During research, I noticed that there are several aspects that may be the subject of future research. My research limitations are related primarily to the type of texts used. I chose literary works whose method of construction is dynamic in terms of the narrator – narratee relationship and have a discourse about the discourse. I have not proved the usefulness of the defined instruments in texts whose discourse is built entirely by the same narrator, being in relation with probably the same type of narratee. I believe that it would be of interest for future research to analyse the stances of the narratee in a work that unfolds entirely according to the conventions of the diary or, in contrast, in a discourse built by a neutral, distant, impersonal narrator. I have not entered this area of research, but I intuitively believe that there are several narrative situations that require other analysis tools.

I also believe that it would be of interest to continue this research to reflect on the following questions:

1. What is the difference between the narratee of a narrative literary discourse and the narratee of a narrative nonliterary discourse?
2. Does the profile of the narratee evolve over time, with the evolution of the history of literature?
3. Is there a profile of the narratee specific to the written discourse belonging to an author?
4. Does the narrator – narratee relationship illustrate a cultural example of relating with the “other” which is specific of an era?

I am aware that I did not find solutions to all issues raised by the stances of the narratee, that the theoretical tools provide by me can be improved, and that there will probably be not only answers to the above questions, but also other questions, the list remaining open.

Bibliografie

Achim, Diana, *Stances of the Narratee*, în „Journal of Humanistic and Social Studies”, papers presented at the International Symposium “RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IN INNOVATION ERA”, “Aurel Vlaicu” University of Arad, 8-9 th of November 2012, Volume III, No. 2 (6)/2012, pp. 9-20.

Achim, Diana, *Ipostaze ale naratarului în Patul lui Procust de Camil Petrescu* în *Studii filologice și teologice*, coordonator Corneliu Pădurean, referenți științifici Lizica Mihuț, Ionel Funeriu, Ioan Tulcan, Constantin Rus, Editura Gutenberg Univers, Arad, 2014, pp. 13-27.

Achim, Diana, *Lectura naratarului în Hanu-Ancuței de Mihail Sadoveanu I*, în „Limba Română”, Nr.1-2, anul XXVI, Chișinău, 2016.

Adam, Jean Michel, *Le récit*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1984.

Aristotel, *Poetica*, Editura Academiei, București, 1965.

Aristotel, *Retorica*, ediție bilingvă, traducere, studiu introductiv și index de Maria-Cristina Andrieș, note și comentarii de Ștefan-Sebastian Maftעי, Editura Iri, București, 2004.

Auerbach, Erich, *Mimesis. Reprezentarea realității în literatura occidentală*, în românește de I. Negoïtescu, prefață de Romul Munteanu, Editura pentru Literatură Universală, București, 1967.

Austin, J. L., *Cum să faci lucruri cu vorbe*, traducere de Sorana Corneanu, prefață de Vlad Alexandrescu, Editura Paralela 45, București, 2003.

Bal, Mieke, *Naratologia. Introducere în teoria narațiunii*, Ediția a II-a, traducere de Sorin Pârveu, cuvânt înainte de Monica Botez, Institutul European, Iași, 2008.

Balotă, Nicolae, *Arta lecturii*, Editura Cartea Românească, București, 1978.

Balzac, Honoré de, *Béatrix. Eugénie Grandet*, traducere de Haralambie Grămescu și Cezar Petrescu, Editura Cartea Românească, 1982.

Barthes, Roland, *Romanul scriiturii*, antologie, selecție de texte și traducere Adriana Babeți și Delia Șepețean-Vasilii, prefață de Adriana Babeți, postfață de Delia Șepețean-Vasilii, Editura Univers, București, 1987.

Benveniste, Émile, *Probleme de lingvistică generală*, vol. I, traducere de Lucia Magdalena Dumitru, Editura Teora, București, 2000.

Bergez, Daniel, Barbéris, Pierre, De Biasi, Pierre-Marc, Marini Marcelle, Valency, Gisèle, *Introduction aux méthodes critiques pour l'analyse littéraire*, sous la direction de Daniel Bergez, Bordas, Paris, 1990.

Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela, Călărășu, Cristina, Ionescu Ruxăndoiu, Liliana, Mancaș, Mihaela, Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela, *Dicționar de științe ale limbii*, Editura Nemira, București, 2001.

Bodiștean, Florica, *O teorie a literaturii*, Editura Mirton, Timișoara, 2005.

Bodiștean, Florica, *Poetica genurilor literare*, Editura Mirton, Timișoara, 2006.

Bollak, Jean, *Sens contra sens: cum citim?* Convorbiri cu Patrick Llored, traducere de Magda Jeanrenaud, prefață de Andrei Corbea, Editura Polirom, București, 2001.

Booth, Wayne C., *Retorica romanului*, traducere de Alina Clej și Ștefan Stoenescu, București, Editura Univers, 1976.

Borges, Jorge Luis, *Sfera lui Pascal*, în *Eseuri*, traducere și note de Irina Dogaru, Cristina Hăulică, Andrei Ionescu și Tudora Șandru-Mehedinți, Editura Polirom, 2015.

Bremond, Claude, *Logica povestirii*, traducere de Micaela Slăvescu, prefață și note de Ioan Pânzaru, București, Editura Univers, 1981.

Budai-Deleanu, Ion, *Țiganiada*, antologie, prefață și note finale de Romul Munteanu, ediție îngrijită de prof. J. Byck, Editura Tineretului, București, 1962.

Călinescu, George, *Istoria literaturii române de la origini până în prezent*, Editura Minerva, București, 1982.

Călinescu, George, *Cronicile optimistului*, E.L., București, 1965.

Călinescu, Matei, *A citi, a reciti, Către o poetică a (re)lecturii*, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2003.

Cărtărescu, Mircea, *Postmodernismul românesc*, Editura Humanitas, București, 1999.

Cioculescu, Șerban, Streinu, Vladimir, Vianu, Tudor, *Istoria literaturii române moderne*, Ediția a II-a, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București, 1971.

Ciopraga, Constantin, *Mihail Sadoveanu*, Editura Tineretului, București, 1970.

Comloșan, Doina, *Despre literatură*, Editura Excelsior Art, Timișoara, 2003.

Comloșan, Doina, *Teoria textului literar*, Editura Universității de Vest, Timișoara, 2003.

Comloșan, Doina, Borchin, Mirela, *Dicționar de comunicare (lingvistică și literară)*, vol. II, Editura Excelsior Art, Timișoara, 2003.

Cordoș, Sanda, *Ce rost mai are să citim literatură?*, Editura Compania, București, 2004.

Cornea, Paul, *Introducere în teoria lecturii*, Ediția a II-a, Editura Polirom, Iași, 1998.

Cornea, Paul, *Studiu introductiv la ediția I*, I. Budai-Deleanu, *Țiganiada*, vol. I, E.S.P.L.A., 1958.

- Crohmălniceanu, Ov. S., *Literatura română între cele două războaie mondiale*, Editura Minerva, București, 1972.
- Ducrot, Oswald, „Esquisse d'une théorie polyphonique de l'énonciation”, *Le Dire et le Dit*, Paris, Ed. De Minuit, 1984.
- Eco, Umberto, *Lector in fabula. Cooperarea interpretativă în textele narative*, Editura Univers, București, 1991.
- Eco, Umberto, *Opera deschisă. Formă și indeterminare în poeticile contemporane*, Ediția a II-a, traducere și prefață de Cornel Mihai Ionescu, Editura Paralela 45, București, 2002.
- Eco, Umberto, *Limitele interpretării*, traducere de Ștefania Mincu și Daniela Bucșă, Editura Pontica, Constanța, 1996.
- Eco, Umberto, *Șase plimbări prin pădurea narativă*, Editura Pontica, Constanța, 1997.
- Eco, Umberto, *Confesiunile unui tânăr romancier*, Editura Polirom, București, 2011.
- Eminescu, Mihai, *Proză literară*, ediție îngrijită de Eugen Simion și Flora Șuteu, cu un studiu introductiv de Eugen Simion, Editura pentru literatură, 1964.
- Fontanier, Pierre, *Figurile limbajului*, traducere, prefață și note Antonia Constantinescu, Editura Univers, București, 1977.
- Genette, Gérard, *Figuri*, selecție, traducere și prefață de Angela Ioan și Irina Mavrodin, București, Editura Univers, 1978.
- Genette, Gérard, *Figures III*, collection Poétique, aux Éditions du Seuil, Paris, 1972.
- Genette, Gérard, *Introducere în arhitect. Ficțiune și dicțiune*, traducere și prefață de Ion Pop, Editura Univers, București, 1994.
- Genette, Gérard, *Opera artei* vol. II, *Relația estetică*, traducere de Muguraș Constantinescu, Editura Univers, București, 2000.
- Hăulică, Cristina, *Textul ca intertextualitate. Pornind de la Borges*, Editura Eminescu, București, 1981.
- Houbedine, Jean-Louis, *Cercetarea preliminară a noțiunii de text*, text tradus din volumul *Théorie d'ensemble*, Ed. du Seuil, coll. „Tel Quel”, Paris, 1968, publicat în *Nouvelle critique*, nr. 11, sub titlul *Texte, structure, histoire*, în volumul *Pentru o teorie a textului*, Antologie „Tel Quel” 1960-1971, introducere, antologie și traducere de Adriana Babeți și Delia Șepețean-Vasiliu, Editura Univers, București, 1980.
- Iosifescu, Silvan, *Construcție și lectură*, Editura Univers, București, 1970.
- Iser, Wolfgang, *Actul lecturii: o teorie a efectului estetic*, traducere din limba germană, note și prefață de Romanița Constantinescu, Pitești, Editura Paralela 45, 2006.

- Jauss, Hans Robert, *Question and Answer: Forms of Dialogic Understanding*, Translated by Michael Hays, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.
- Jenny, Laurent, *Rostirea singulară*, traducere și postfață de Ioana Bot, prefață de Jean Starobinski, Editura Univers, București, 1999.
- Kayser, Wolfgang, *Opera literară. O introducere în știința literaturii*, traducere și note de H.R. Radian, cuvânt înainte de Mihai Pop, Editura Univers, București, 1979.
- Kristeva, Julia, *Le texte du roman. Approche sémiologique d'une structure discursive transformationnelle*, The Hague, Mouton, 1970.
- Kristeva, Julia, *Problemele structurii textului*, text tradus din volumul *Théorie d'ensemble*, Ed. du Seuil, coll. „Tel Quel”, Paris, 1968, în volumul *Pentru o teorie a textului*, Antologie „Tel Quel” 1960-1971, introducere, antologie și traducere de Adriana Babeți și Delia Șepețean-Vasiliiu, Editura Univers, București, 1980.
- Lintvelt, Jaap, *Încercare de tipologie narativă. Punctul de vedere – teorie și analiză*, traducere de Angela Martin, studiu introductiv de Mircea Martin, Editura Univers, București, 1994.
- Manolescu, Nicolae, *Arca lui Noe. Eseu despre romanul românesc*, Vol. I, II, III, Editura Minerva, București, 1981.
- Manolescu, Nicolae, *Lecturi infidele*, Editura pentru literatură, București, 1966.
- Manolescu, Nicolae, *Metamorfozele poeziei. Metamorfozele romanului*, ediție îngrijită de Mircea Mihăieș, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2003.
- Manolescu, Nicolae, *Istoria critică a literaturii române. 5 secole de literatură*, Editura Paralela 45, Pitești, 2008.
- Marino, Adrian, *Biografia ideii de literatură*, III, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1994.
- Marino, Adrian, *Critica ideilor literare*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1974.
- Mincu, Marian, *Textualism și autenticitate*, Editura Pontica, Constanța, 1993.
- Moeschler, Jacques, Reboul, Anne, *Dicționar enciclopedic de pragmatică*, coordonarea traducerii Carmen Vlad și Liana Pop, Editura Echinoc, Cluj-Napoca, 1999.
- Nedelciu, Mircea, Babeți, Adriana, Mihăieș, Mircea, *Femeia în roșu*, prefață de Mircea Cărtărescu, ediția a III-a, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2003.
- Ohmann, Richard, în *Poetica americană. Orientări actuale*. Studii critice, antologie, note și bibliografie de Mircea Borcilă și Richard McLain, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, , 1981.
- Pamuk, Orhan, *Romancierul naiv și sentimental*, traducere din engleză și note de Rebeca Turcuș, Editura Polirom, București, 2012.

- Petrescu, Camil, *Patul lui Procust*, Ediție îngrijită și curriculum vitae de Florica Ichim, Editura 100+1 Gramar, București, 1996.
- Piwowarczyk, Mary Ann, *The Narratee and the Situation of Enunciation: A Reconsideration of Prince's Theory*, „Genre”, 9 (1976), pp. 161-177.
- Platon, *Republica*, în *Opere*, V, traducere de Andrei Cornea, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1986.
- Poenar, Horea, *Teoria peștelui-fantomă. Zece studii și șapte scurt-metraje despre teorie*, Editura Tracus Arte, București, 2016.
- Popa, Marian, *Homo fictus. Structuri și ipostaze*, Editura pentru Literatură, București, 1968.
- Prince, Gerald, *Dicționar de naratologie*, traducere de Sorin Pârvu, Institutul European, Iași, 2004.
- Prince, Gerald, *Introduction à l'étude du narrataire*, „Poétique”, nr. 14, april 1973.
- Propp, Vladimir I., *Morfologia basmului*, traducere de Radu Nicolau, Editura Univers, București, 1970.
- Propp, Vladimir I., *Rădăcinile istorice ale basmului fantastic*, traducere de Radu Nicolau, prefață de Nicolae Roșianu, Editura Univers, București, 1973.
- Ray, William, *Recognizing Recognition: The Intra-textual and Extra-textual Critical Persona*, „Diacritics”, Vol. 7, no.4, 1977, pp. 20-33.
- Ricardou, Jean, *Noi probleme ale romanului*, în românește de Liana și Valentin Atanasiu, prefață de Irina Mavrodin, Editura Univers, București, 1988.
- Ricœur, Paul, *Eseuri de hermeneutică*, traducere de Vasile Tonoiu, București, Editura Humanitas, 1995.
- Ricœur, Paul, *Du texte a l'action, Essais d'herméneutique II*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris, 1986.
- Ricœur, Paul, *Soi-même comme un autre*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris, 1990.
- Riffaterre, Michael, *The Self-Sufficient Text*, „Diacritics”, Vol. 3, No. 3, 1973, pp. 39-45.
- Sadoveanu, Mihail, *Hanu-Ancuței. Țara de dincolo de negură*, Ediție îngrijită de Fănuș Băileșteanu și Valeria Filimon, postfață și tabel cronologic de Fănuș Băileșteanu, Editura Agora, București, 2005.
- Said, Edward W., *The Text, the World, The Critic*, The Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1975, pp. 1-23.
- Searle, John R., în *Poetica americană. Orientări actuale*. Studii critice, antologie, note și bibliografie de Mircea Borcilă și Richard McLain, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1981.

Sollers, Philippe, *Nivelurile semantice ale unui text modern*, text tradus din volumul *Théorie d'ensemble*, Ed. du Seuil, coll. „Tel Quel”, Paris, 1968, în volumul *Pentru o teorie a textului*, Antologie „Tel Quel” 1960-1971, introducere, antologie și traducere de Adriana Babeți și Delia Șepețean-Vasiliiu, Editura Univers, București, 1980.

Starobinski, Jean, *Textul și interpretul*, traducere și prefață de Ion Pop, Editura Univers, București, 1985.

Todorov, Tzvetan, *Poetica. Gramatica Decameronului*, traducere și studiu introductiv de Paul Miclău, Editura Univers, București, 1975.

Todorov, Tzvetan, *Povestirea primitivă*, text tradus din volumul *Poétique de la prose*, Ed. du Seuil, coll. „Poétique”, 1971, în volumul *Pentru o teorie a textului*, Antologie „Tel Quel” 1960-1971, introducere, antologie și traducere de Adriana Babeți și Delia Șepețean-Vasiliiu, Editura Univers, București, 1980.

Toma, Radu, *Epistemă, ideologie, roman: secolul XVIII francez*, Editura Univers, București, 1982.

Tzara, Tristan, *Șapte manifeste DADA. Lampisteries. Omul aproximativ 1925-1930*, versiuni românești, prefață și note de Ion Pop, Editura Univers, București, 1996.

Van Cuilenburg, J.J., Scholten, O., Noomen, G.W., *Știința comunicării*, versiune românească și studiu introductiv de Tudor Olteanu, Editura Humanitas, București, 1998.

Vianu, Tudor, *Arta prozatorilor români*, Editura Minerva, București, 1981.

Vlad, Ion, *Descoperirea operei. Comentarii de teorie literară*, Editura Dacia, Cluj, 1970.

Vlad, Ion, *Lectura romanului*, Editura Dacia, Cluj, 1983.

Wellek, René, Warren, Austin, *Teoria literaturii*, în românește de Rodica Tiniș, studiu introductiv și note de Sorin Alexandrescu, Editura pentru Literatură Universală, București, 1967.

***, *Pentru o teorie a textului*, Antologie „Tel Quel” 1960-1971, Introducere, antologie și traducere de Adriana Babeți și Delia Șepețean-Vasiliiu, Editura Univers, București, 1980.

Dicționarul Explicativ al Limbii Române, (DEX) Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, București, 1975.

Dicționarul ortografic, ortoepic și morfologic al limbii române, Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, Ediția a II-a revăzută și adăugită, București.

e-Bibliografie

<http://www.dictio.ro/juridic/circumstante-atenuante>, adresă accesată în 25.06.2016, ora 19.45.

<http://www.lapunkt.ro/2013/05/14/despre-primii-forumisti-romani/>, adresă accesată în 8 iulie 2016, ora 18.00.

https://www.jstor.org/stable/464854?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents, adresă accesată în 10 iulie 2016, ora 18.00

<https://www.fichier-pdf.fr/2013/07/07/genette-gerard-figures-iii-discours-de-r-gerard-genette-1/preview/page/262/>

<https://dexonline.ro/>

https://www.jstor.org/stable/464526?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents, adresă accesată în 10 iulie 2016, ora 18.30.

https://www.jstor.org/stable/464854?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents, adresă accesată în 10 iulie 2016, ora 18.00.