

... ,

(). [17, . 145].

[11, . 64-65].

: "actant – a fundamental role at the narrative deep structure" [18, . 1], "actor – the concretization of an actant at the level of narrative surface structure" [18, . 3] [2, . 9, 14; 7, . 8].

" " : "A character is not a real-life person but only a 'paper being' [11, . 237-272] a being created by an author and existing only within a fictional text, either on the level of action or on the level of fictional mediation" [12, . 347-367; 15, . 49-54].

: "It is an existent endowed with anthropomorphic traits and engaged in anthropomorphic actions" [18, . 12].

[7, . 128-129]. " "

[16, . 230].

(), (), - ,
()
, sui generic (- [8, . 8])
(. , -
;
;
” [4, . 151].

() ().

([1, . 3; 5, . 49]): (1)
“Charles murmured a polite agreement. He had touched exactly that same sore spot with his uncle, a can of a very different political complexion” [6, . 133]; (2) “He opened the door at last and turned to say his goodbyes” [10, . 59]; (3) “He asked for clarification and was answered, it appeared, with riddles” [5, . 130].

(1, 2, 3) : Ns (1), Ns (2), Ns
Ns - [19, . 184].

(), (4, 5),
(4)
“She asked about everything, and he told her very exactly and minutely, in a queer p dantic way that made her want to laugh ...” [7, . 413]. (5) “Oh, yes, he assured her, he loved pizza. He followed Melanie down the hall to the ground-floor living-room” [9, . 80].

: oh, yes, Ns assured (4).

(4) asked, told –

pedantic –

(6)

(6) “Euan said, ‘It was folded up in a heap of Sophia’s accounts. It’s clear from these that she found Jane Summers and paid her the bequest. And kept the bit of paper. I imagine she felt she’d done all that was necessary – carried out her sister’s intentions – and simply put the bit of paper away” [5, . 436].

[9, . 26-28; 14, . 250].

(7) “He asked her one night if she had seen the horns growing on Chamcha’s head, but she went deaf and, instead of answering, told him how she would sit on a camp stool by the galpon or bull-pen at Los Alamos and the prize bulls would come up and lay their horned heads in her lap” [13, . 147].

(7)

and.

→

(7).

(6):

ego,

(

[6, . 343].

[14, . 260],

(8).

(8).

∴ (8) “They might do as they liked – this she realized as she went to sleep. How could anything that gave one satisfaction be excluded? What was degrading? Who cared? Degrading things were real, with a different reality. And he was so unabashed and unrestrained. Wasn’t it rather horrible, a man who could be so soulful and spiritual, now to

be so – she balked at her own thoughts and memories: then she added – so bestial? So bestial, they two! – so degraded! She winced. But after all, why not? She exulted as well. Why not be bestial, and go the whole round of experience? She exulted in it. She was bestial. How good it was to be really shameful! [8, . 360].

(8), “Women in Love” . . . ,

: *What was degrading? Who cared? – so bestial? they two! – so degraded! why not?*

(8).

[11, . 228] [19]. (9) “Hey, I yelled, are you listening to me?”

: (10) “He might meet other helpers, he told himself, to keep his spirits up” [3, . 127].

(11) What, [3, . 5]. (11),

(11) “And what more? What more would be necessary? The great mass of activity in which mankind was engaged meant nothing to him. By nature, he had no part in it. What did he live for, then? For Anna only, and for the sake of living? What did he want on this earth? Anna only, and his children, and his life with his children and her? Was there no

more? He was attended by a sense of something more, something further, which gave him absolute being. It was as if now he existed in Eternity ...” [7, . 193].

(„free indirect discourse”),

[6, . 335; 13, . 349-350]

[18, . 34]

[14,

. 258-259]:

(12) “The emissaries argued, pleaded, raged” [13, . 404];

(13) “He had not told her, and could not tell her, about his secret theft” [5, . 20]; (14) “She had talked about thresholds and he had given an authentic paper on “The potent Castrato: the phallogocentric structuration of Balzac’s hermaphrodite heroines” [5, . 57];

(15) “He wonders if can kiss her. He doesn’t exactly want to” [4, . 19];

(16) “John Ottokar says he will go with his brother, in the ambulance” [4, . 457];

(17) “Why should his life be put in jeopardy by this horrible little nuance? Mike had a well-disciplined mind. He put these protests aside and took a deep breath, drawing in power” [2, . 7];

(18) “‘Something’s happened’.

Her silence was assent.

‘For God’s sake tell me what it is.’

‘I can’t’. She was still walking on.

Bernard shouted, ‘June! This is outrageous’.

‘Don’t ask me to talk.

Help me to get to St Maurice, Bernard. Please” [10, . 153];

(19) “Chicky says: You have to go home don’t you? To Julia.

Julia says, Yeah.

All right then, answers Rachel. Sure” [12, . 163].

, [20, . 130].

, unspeakable sentences,

[9].

[6, .338].

(20).

(20) “‘But why should I be a demon –?’ she asked.

‘ “Woman wailing for her demon lover” – ’ he quoted – ‘why, I don’t know’” [8, .34].

(21) “The night before, Phil had told him, in the kitchen (Simon and Jake were also present, tacit, collusive, sloped over their Gold Blends), that all this ‘nonsense’, all this recent ‘rubbish’, all this ‘silly buggers’, would presently be ‘sorted. Presently: like tomorrow” [1, .482].

(22) “She took his hands in hers. ‘But I haven’t finished looking at your eyes.’ Then, with the Berlin girl’s forthrightness Russell had praised, she added, ‘Du Dummer! Wenn es für dich das erste Mal ist, bin ich sehr glücklich. When this is your first time, then I am a very lucky girl’” [10, .59].

(20, 21, 22)

(21),

(20, 21, 22)

(22),

AREA SALES DISCOURSE CHARACTER IN FOCUS READERS’ PERCEPTIONS

I.A. Behta

The article is devoted to the analysis of the fictional text of the English post/modern period where the general principles of the textual structuring are manifested. They are necessary for the comprehension of the fictional text of the period of post/modern as speech and thought presentation in such texts is not considered the system of deviations from the language norm, but the system of gaining proficiency in a diverse communicatively-pragmatic and artistic potential of the language.

Key words: English postmodern, speech art activity, discourse zone

1. . . . 10.02.04 < > / , 1986. – 16 .

2. . . .) – INTRADA, 2001. – 384 c.
 3. . . . : : . 10.02.04
« . . . » / – , 1989. – 20
 4. . . . : [. . . .] / – : , 2001. – 270
 5. . . . : –
 6. / – : (. . . . – , 1980. – 208) / – : « », 1996. – 464
 7. . . . / – : , 2002. – 173
 8. . . . , : – /] – : , 1986. – 263
 9. Banfield A. Unspeakable Sentences. Narration and representation in the language of fiction. – L.: Rutledge, 1982. – 331 p.
 10. Barthes R. An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative // *New Literary History*. – 6. – 1975. – P. 237–272.
 11. Gellay A. Narrative Crossing. Theory and Pragmatics of Prose Fiction. – Baltimore & London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1987. – 175 p.
 12. Hopkins M. F. & Perkins L. Second Person Point of View in Narrative. // *Critical Survey of Short Fiction* / Ed. F. N. Magill. – New Jersey: Salem, 1981. – P. 119–132.
 13. Jahn M. Frames, Preferences, and the Reading of Third-Person Narrative: Towards a Cognitive Narratology // *Poetics Today*. – 1997. – Vol. 18, 4. – P. 441–468.
 14. McHale B. Free Indirect Discourse: A Survey of Recent Account // *A Journal of Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature*. – 1978. – 3. – P. 249–287.
 15. O'Neill P. Fictions of Discourse: Reading Narrative Theory. – Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994. – 188 p.
 16. Peer W. van, & Maat H. P. Narrative perspective and the interpretation of characters' motives // *Language and Literature. Journal of the Poetics and Linguistics Association*. – Oxford: The Alden press, 2001. – Vol. 10, 3. – P. 229–241.
 17. *Philosophy of Literature. Contemporary and Classic Readings. An Anthology* / Ed. by E. John & D. Lopes. – L.: Blackwell, 2004. – 364 p.
 18. Prince G. *A Dictionary of Narratology*. – Aldershot: Gower Publishing Company Ltd., 1988. – 120 p.
 19. Short M. *Understanding texts: point of view* // *Language and understanding. Research Centre for English and Applied Linguistics University of Cambridge*. – Oxford: OUP, 1995. – 208 p.
 20. Toolan M. J. (ed.) *Language, Text and Context: essays in stylistics*. – L. & N.Y.: Rutledge, 1992. – 320 p.
1. Amis M. *The Information*. – L.: Flamingo, 1996. – 494 p.
 2. Burroughs S. W. *The Place of Dead Roads*. – N.Y.: Henry Holt & Co., 2001. – 306 p.
 3. Byatt A. S. *Angels & Insects*. – L.: Vintage, 1995. – 290 p.
 4. Byatt A. S. *Babel Tower*. – L.: Vintage, 1997. – 617 p.
 5. Byatt A. S. *Possession*. – L.: Vintage, 1991. – 511 p.
 6. Fowles J. *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. – Triad, Granada, 1980. – 399 p.
 7. Lawrence D. H. *The Rainbow*. – L.: Penguin Books, 2000. – 495 p.
 8. Lawrence D. H. *Women in Love*. – L.: Wordsworth Classics, 1992. – 421 p.
 9. Lodge D. *Trilogy. Changing Places. Small World. Nice Work*. – L.: Penguin Books, 1993. – 897 p.
 10. McEwan I. *The Innocent*. – L.: Pan Books, 1990. – 245 p.
 11. *New writing 4. An Anthology* / ed. by A. S. Byatt & A. Hollinghurst. – L.: Vintage, 1995. – 448 p.
 12. *New writing 8. An Anthology* / ed. by T. Fischer & L. Norfolk. – L.: Vintage, 1999. – 561 p.
 13. Rushdie S. *The Satanic Verses*. – L.: Vintage, 1998. – 547 p.

18 2011 .

<http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/19917>