

UDC 930.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24195/spj2310-2896.2019.4.14>**Rodian Maria Volodymyrivna**

Senior lecturer of the Department of Cultural Studies

Faculty of History and Philosophy

Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University

2, Dvoryanska str., Odesa, Ukraine

HISTORICAL NARRATIVE AS METHODOLOGY RESEARCH OF THE PAST

The article deals with the process of development of the theory of historical narrative as methodology research of the past. Attention is focused on the issues of linking the historical narrative with the reality of the past and the influence of the subject-object relations in the course of the historian's presentation of the results of his research. The transformation of perception of theorists of historical narratives of the problem of connection between the text and the reality of the past is traced. The study of historical narrative theory begins with an examination of the analytic tradition of seeing the connection between the text of the historian and the past, which he explores. Emphasis is placed on the logical-deductive element of constructing the results of his research by the historian, and the specificity of the analysts' perception of this issue is considered. Drawing on the achievements of the analytical philosophy of history in the article, the postmodern narrative theory of history developed by the American Researcher H. White is analyzed. The study of this theory is considered in connection with the analytical tradition, the common roots of the two trends are traced and the differences between them are determined. Also the focus is on the poetry-rhetorical element of the historical narrative and the question of the adequacy of reflecting the reality of the past in the text of the historian.

The most important achievement of narrativism can be called pluralism and blurring the boundaries of true and false in the history of writing. The proclamation of information about the past that the historian extracts from archives doomed to be transformed by the metaphor unknowingly chosen by the researcher to combine the results of the study has made the distance between the text and historical reality unbridgeable. The historical reality in terms of narrativism cannot be depicted, but can only be constructed. Hoping to find ways that would overcome the metaphorical subjugation of social reality, F. Ankersmit developed a theory that foresees the possibility of gaining an immediate experience of the past and its reflection, unrelated to tropology.

Key words: *historical narrative, theory, postmodernity, metaphor, analytical theory of history.*

Introduction. The problem of the theory of historical narratives to date actualizes the question of the subjectivity of historical texts. Despite the fact that modern historical science has clear criteria for the study of sources, a certain algorithm of work, designed to help establish the truth of the information they carry, we can state that accusations of the subjectivity of historical texts are common not only to a wide audience, but also in the domestic academic environment. The problem of subjectivity does not arise in the phase of researching sources and establishing certain information about the past (although it is impossible to completely exclude subjectivism when working with sources), but in integrating the results of his research and trying to construct a holistic picture of the past, explain or understand it. Using similar sources to cover the same issues leads to the construction of different representations of history. The study of the theory of historical narratives aims to uncover the causes of the above problem of subjectivity.

Also, this problem is actualized due to the lack of a common vision in contemporary studies regarding the connection between narrative and the past. With participation, the methodological discourses of the theory of historical narrative are multivariate, which makes it possible to assert the existence of a spectrum of ideas within it. Therefore, there is a need to investigate the foundations on which different visions of the theory of historical narrative are based and to find out further perspectives on their development.

The purpose of the article – implementation analysis of the components of the theory of historical narrative in the second half of the XX – beginning of XXI centuries.

The study focuses on the genetically related areas of the methodology and philosophy of the study of the past, which reveal the essence of the theory of historical narrative and attempts to modify it.

Analysis of recent scientific research. This intelligence is based on an analysis of the writings of historians and historians of historical science who have constructed and developed the narrative theory of history, as well as their followers and opponents. The study was based on the works of H. White [12–14] and F. Ankersmit [1; 2; 10; 11]. In addition to the works of these scientists, we used the works of E. Domanska [5], R. Aron [4], interviews with J. Topolsky [8], H. Kellner [7], G. Iggers [6]. One of the important problems of the modern theory of historical narrative, raised in the works of the aforementioned researchers, is the ratio of text historian sending it past reality. Historical narrative theory and the theory of historical research is inherently different directions methodology of history. They differ in the parameter that is important for understanding the issues of this article.

Outline of the main research material. Theories of historical research are aimed at building a methodological justification for the activity of the historian during the process of gathering information about the past and the possibility of establishing its truth. In other words, the theories of historical research focus on the phase of the historian's work with sources, the result of which is expressed in separate statements in the past. The criterion for these statements is truth or error. It is believed that the receipt of information and its subsequent presentation (writing by the historian of the work) is an inseparable, genetically linked process. If there are established ways of obtaining true information about the past, the question of adequate representation has no doubt in.

The theory of historical narrative is based on other principles. For her, the difference between two phases of a historian's work is important: the accumulation of results (work with sources) and the integration of these results into text (the phase of writing). It proceeds from the fundamental position that the historian, in the phase of writing, that is, of constructing a coherent text, transcends the analytic-compositional method, and therefore the texts differ in logic from the logic of individual sentences. Historical writing cannot be completely reduced to historical research and its results. In other words, the theory of historical narrative recognizes a certain independence of the text as wholeness from the results of the study of the historian, expressed in separate logical statements.

In order to understand clearly the starting points of the theory of historical narrative, we need to find the strengths that became the basis for its development. According to the value of the Polish Researcher E. Domanska, the narrative theory of history contrasted with the analytical philosophy of history [5, p. 8], and therefore the search should begin precisely in the analytical tradition of the historical record. The beginning of the development of traditional analytical philosophy is associated with the names E. Moore, B. Russell and L. Wittgenstein. The main idea behind the activity of these thinkers was to comprehend reality through the prism of "perfect" language. An ideal language should be devoid of the inaccuracies, contradictions and ambiguities inherent in natural, everyday language. An ideal language is a formal language. The starting points on which these researchers relied were taken from the field of mathematical logic, and therefore the early concepts of the language of analytical philosophy are regarded as the result of the use of logic-mathematical methods [2, p. 9].

Summarizing the features of early analytical philosophy, state its characteristics [2, p. 10]:

1. Absolutization of the formal approach to language. This was based on the premise and opportunity to build a language devoid of inaccuracies, which can be described diversity of phenomenal reality.

2. It is understood as "the image of the world" and not a means of expression. It was believed that in order to achieve authentic knowledge, it was necessary to construct a language that would adequately reflect objective reality, because language is an image of that reality.

3. The concept of truth was not considered outside the scope of statements about the facts of reality that can be expressed by using the apparatus of logic as a science.

4. On the basis of analysis and explication of such concepts as "meaning", "meaning", "truth", "expression" there was a distinction between the concepts of language-object (formalized construction) and metalanguage (logical-semantic analysis of language-object).

In the further development of the ideas of analytical philosophy, changes took place, the emphasis gradually shifted from linguistic philosophy to philosophy of consciousness, which formed the modern sphere of research of this tradition. In addition, there was a kind of “humanization” of analytical philosophy, related to the expansion of its interaction with the humanities, including history. The basis of consideration of the analytical philosophy of history was laid on “Lectures on the Philosophy of History” by R. Aron, read and authored in the 70’s of the twentieth century in the Collage de France [4]. In this work, the researcher makes a deep analysis of the analytical tradition in the history of writing and its relation to German hermeneutics. As noted, the analytical philosophy of history absolutizes the value of logic in constructing true statements about reality. Also, this postulate remains valid for constructing statements about the reality of the past. For analysts, the difference between the psychology of the historian and the logic of historical discourse is fundamentally important [4, p. 77]. From this it follows that logic and not interested in one’s objective, which is written history work, and only intentionality, which he admits – it intends to reach the truth. R. Aaron points out: “Why is there this difference between the psychology of the historian and the logic of historical discourse? Because the historian, by strict definition, is a person whose purpose is to express the truth about the events of the past. That the statements of the past can be true or false regardless of the historian’s intentions. From the standpoint of logic, any history, any historical narrative consists of statements that claim to truth and say the truth about the facts, events or relationship events. So if you take this logical definition of history, for logic there is no difference between the types of stories” [4, p. 77].

This way, we can see extrapolation methods and approach, developed by analytic philosopher’s, the exploration of the past. The basis for the true reflection of the past are properly formulated, in terms of logic, statements. These and judgments are directly related to a historical fact that becomes the criterion of truth in this tradition. For analysts, operating the notion of “truth” about reality, including the reality of the past, is fundamentally important. In the logic there is no doubt as to the existence of the past, which acts as their understanding of the subject that can supply us true information about himself and the goal is to express the information in a logical expression. Accordingly, devoid of any emotional coloring associated with the psychological adjustment of the historian, logical expression provides us with true information about the past. Importantly, analysts do not believe that is possible through logical statement to build a complete picture of the past, since acknowledge that no event or phenomenon can be integrally claimed and acknowledged. The past is being reconstructed. But it does not it means is that the fragmentary information about it cannot be true. The question remains as to the relationship between the individual statements of the past or the connection between the facts expressed in those statements. To answer this question, the key is the analysts’ position that “any story conveys related events” [5, p. 79]. A necessary condition for the reconstruction of the part of the past by the historian in his work, no matter what his character, must be the operation of statements that, first, have a true connection with the past (with the facts of the past), and, second, must be logically linked to each other. This connection of one statement of the past with another in the text of the historian has an element of interpretation that implicitly explains to us the logic of the sequence. R. Aron notes that if there is no minimum of sequence, then there is no history [4, p. 80].

Summarizing the impact on the development of the theory of historical studies of analytical philosophy, we note that historical science was influenced by the linguistic turn in philosophy, resulting in the perception of the historian, primarily as a generator of statements about the past. The subject of the study was the expression of the historian and their connection with the past. The work of the historian regarded as the reconstruction of historical reality by constructing a logical relationship between different true statements about the past. The interrelation between individual statements is the result of the introduction of a minimum of interpretation into the text, which is a necessary condition for explaining the logical sequence of the statements of the historical text. These theses are key to understanding the formation of postmodern narrative theory developed by H. White.

The origins of narrative theory start from the claim that the work of the historian, into which he integrated the results of his research, is not a simple sequence of logic-based statements about the reality

of the past. The narrative that combines different statements about the past is integral not by logic, but because the way which is chosen to create a narrative historian. In modern language, the closest meaning to the word trope is style [12, p. 2]. Consideration of the integrity of the historical narrative through the prism of style or form that unites it has led to the appeal of literary theory to history theorists, the first of whom is H. White, for it has the necessary tools for the study of the text as a whole. The main tool of narrative theory was tropology. It is thanks to her H. White has researched different aspects of historical discourse: the ontological and epistemological, ethical and ideological, aesthetic and formal. H. White defines tropology follows: “Tropology – a theoretical explanation fictional discourse, all types of figures (metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and irony) create the types of images and the links between them, are able to serve as marks of reality, discursive connections between figures (people, events, processes) in discourse are not logical connections or deductive connections of one another, in the general sense they are metaphorical, that is, based on the poetic technique of condensation, substitution, symbolization and revision” [13, p. 8]. The tropology theory of historical discourse implies understanding of the past as a space of fantasy, that is, something that cannot be reproduced but imagined. But fantasy in this case it means is that the historian invents the past. Imagination contributes to the organization of historical facts obtained by the researcher while working with sources, and the result of this organization (i.e. the text of the historian, narrative), often speaks of those things that cannot be substantiated by the results of their research. The historian’s text-based tectonics archive, created by him on the basis of his own compositional considerations, transformed the materials he had collected in the archives [13, p. 35]. This postulate brought history to literary theory, because it was necessary to watch the characteristics of different methods of representation.

Thus, narrative theory perceives the past as a construct, an-rooted reality, embedded in a grid of narratives. Indeed, the rhetoric does not recognize a single right way of speech and its representation, because it is arbitrary in the relation to the world. And the correctness of discourse, its truth is determined by those who have the power to do it, not by idealistic absolute truth. It is not found, but constructed. Pay more attention to this thesis narrative art along on the category of “truth” because it is the most controversial and leads to far-reaching consequences. H. Kellner in his interview with E. Domanska stated that the concept of “truth” cannot be detached from the audience that perceives it. Since there cannot be a universal audience, and the existence of universal truths put under question [7, p. 62–64]. It follows from his other thesis that the past is only a way of existing and that presenting the “true” past is impossible from this point of view. It can be made right for a certain moment, and the correctness is determined by various power structures. In this case, it recognizes the distance between reality and the language that describes it.

This position on historical truth is not shared by all historians and theorists, at least given the ethical implications of such a position. G. Iggers wondered: “... if we demonstrate the line between fact and fiction and equate history with fiction, then how can we protect ourselves from claims that the Holocaust has never happened?” [6, p. 165]. However, it should be noted that narrativism does not imply speculation of the facts expressed in individual sentences. Their relationship with the past is not abandoned. However, inscribed in narratives and united by a certain plot (“plot” is an important category of theory of historical narrative), facts are deformed depending on the path chosen by the historian, which is made unconsciously, but necessarily by every researcher. Such a “doom” of the historian to construct the past in H. White’s narrativism is associated with the tradition of Kantian transcendentalism. In this regard, in particular, focuses F. Ankersmit, who developed the antiwhite theory in nature, although the author determined is that their scientific research began with narrativism [10, p. 137–153]. F. Ankersmit attempted to overcome the distance between text and reality historian of the past that H. White and his followers announced persists.

To understand F. Ankersmit’s way of moving away from the unconditional constructivism of the theory of historical narrative, let us turn to the notion of metaphor, one of the key categories of narrativism. Comparing the White metaphor and Kantian transcendentalism, F. Ankersmit focuses on their functional equivalence. Both the Kantian transcendental subject and the metaphorical point of view allow us to organize reality, to make the unknown known. The author points out that,

in general, metaphor is effective in organizing knowledge in ways that can serve our social and political ends (and this also explains why the social, political, and therefore historical world is a favorite scope of metaphor) [1, p. 37–38]. It was noted above that the tropological theory of historical narrative involves the use of imagination by the historian. That imagination is worth to emphasize is the instrument scientist, which he uses to integrate their results in the narrative. The imagination of the historian is transformed into a narrative in accordance with his chosen style or path. There are four such tropes, as H. White points out, in the Western European intellectual environment. These and tropological models of explanation and conditioned the descriptions of socio-historical reality, customary for Western man [1, p. 42]. The function of metaphor is to turn the unknown into the known, to tame the past and to explain it to us, and H. White is associated with two categories of eighteenth-century aesthetics. This is a category of beauty. In aesthetic theory, the beautiful is associated with “order”, “feeling, meaning and expressive action”; beauty, on the contrary, puts us before what is elusive or inaccessible to our attempts at comprehension [1, p. 41]. It emerged is that tropology H. White, the function of which is to tame the reality of the past, make it known to us related to the categories of beauty and sublime aspects lacking. It was around this for centuries the integration of these two aesthetic categories based attempts to overcome F. Ankersmit Kantianism and metaphoric in constructing his theory of history – the theory of the sublime historical experience. The starting point of this theory is experience, which is the central category of Kantian transcendentalism. Accordingly, the experience of the past or the historical experience is laid by F. Ankersmit at the heart of his theory. The main goal of the researcher is to find a way of knowing the past that would avoid the distance between the reality of the past and its representations in the text of the historian. Narrativism proclaims the inevitability of such distance, because, as already stated, metaphor is a way of “taming” the past, not a reflection. The question is: is there a past out forming it into a narrative form trope? Can I claim the story directly? For answers to these questions F. Ankersmit turned to Aristotle’s treatise “On the soul” in which the Greek philosopher constructed an alternative theory claim and knowledge. F. Ankersmit himself remarked that it took Aristotle to move from one paradigm to another, which is a prerequisite for constructing an anti-Kantian theory of historical experience [1, p. 56]. Without going into consideration treatise Aristotle, note that F. Ankersmit found it a starting point for constructing his theory – no separation between subject and object and knowledge that is characteristic of transcendental and epistemological tradition initiated by Descartes and Kant. Thinking Aristotle, takes the form of objects and knowledge directly, which is one of the important characteristics for F. Ankersmit. Further development of his theory, the researcher made, based on the achievement of psychoanalysis of Freud with his belief that consciousness is able to record the personal psychological history of the individual. Freud argued for the identity of the neurotic’s behavior during his recollection of a certain trauma from his life and the experience of the trauma itself. As F. Ankersmit said: “It was the experience and how this experience is reflected in the neurotic psyche has structural similarity or at least a close relationship, the analogy with the theory of sensory knowledge Aristotle obvious” [1, p. 60]. Studies of the theoretical achievements of Aristotle and Freud needed to confirm the existence of the possibility of direct knowledge of the past, although in this case only by personal past experiences of trauma. The experience of personal experience of the past was taken by F. Ankersmit as the basis of the theory of elevated historical experience. Author tick is that if we have the ability to have past experience in the true sense of the word, it is a sense of nostalgia that has clear signs of the most successful benchmark in detection historical experience [1, p. 329].

Conclusions and prospects for further scientific development in this direction. To sum up, it is worth noting that the influence of linguistic turn, which took place in philosophy, came into the theory and methodology of history through analytical tradition. Both the analytical philosophy of history and the postmodern theories of historical narrative are the result of a turn to textualism and constructivism in the history of writing. Following the process of formation and transformation of the theory of historical narrative, which we perceive as a holistic integration of the results of the study of the historian, we have seen the starting points and basic tenets of this theory. The most important achievement of narrativism can be called pluralism and blurring the boundaries of true and false in the history of writing. The proclamation of information about the past that the historian extracts from

archives doomed to be transformed by the metaphor unknowingly chosen by the researcher to combine the results of the study has made the distance between the text and historical reality unbridgeable. The historical reality in terms of narrativism cannot be depicted, but can only be constructed. Hoping to find ways that would overcome the metaphorical subjugation of social reality, F. Ankersmit developed a theory that foresees the possibility of gaining an immediate experience of the past and its reflection, unrelated to tropology. A theory built on a completely different from the narrativism, the paradigm was an alternative to the textualization of reality in the second half of the twentieth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Анкерсмит Ф.Р. История и тропология: взлет и падение метафоры / пер. с англ. М. Кукарцева, Е. Коломоец, В. Кашаев. Москва : Прогресс-Традиция, 2003. 496 с.
2. Анкерсмит Ф.Р. Нарративная логика: семантический анализ языка историков / пер. с англ. О. Гавришиной, А. Олейникова; под науч. ред. Л. Б. Макеевой. Москва : Идея-Пресс, 2003. 360 с.
3. Антологія сучасної аналітичної філософії, або жук залишає коробку. Львів : Літопис, 2014. 374 с.
4. Арон Р. Лекции по философии истории: Курс лекций в Коллеж де Франс. Пер. с фр. И.А. Гобозов Москва : Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ». 2012. 335 с.
5. Доманська Е. Історія та сучасна гуманітаристика: дослідження з теорії знання про минуле. Київ : Ніка-Центр, 2012. 264 с.
6. Георг Иггерс. Доманска Э. Философия истории после постмодернизма. Москва : Канон+; РООИ «Реабилитация», 2010. С. 148–166.
7. Ханс Кёллер. Доманска Э. Философия истории после постмодернизма. Москва : Канон+; РООИ «Реабилитация», 2010. С. 62–101.
8. Ежи Топольски. Доманска Э. Философия истории после постмодернизма. Москва : Канон+; РООИ «Реабилитация», 2010. С. 167–196.
9. Ankersmit F. The Dilemma of Contemporary Anglo-Saxon Philosophy of History. *History and Theory*. 1986. Vol. 25. № 4. p. 1–27.
10. Ankersmit F. The Reality Effect in the Writing of History: The Dynamics of Historiographical Topology. *Mededelingen van de Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks*. Deel 52. № 1. Amsterdam, N.Y., 1989. P. 5–42.
11. Ankersmit F. Historiography and Postmodernism. *History and Theory*. 1989. Vol. 28. № 2. P. 137–153.
12. White H. Introduction: Tropology, Discourse, and the Modes of Human Consciousness. *Tropics of discourse: Essays in cultural criticism*. Baltimore; London : The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978. P. 1–25.
13. White H. *Metsahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973. 350 p.
14. White H. Historical Employment and the Problem of Truth. *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the Final Solution*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1992. P. 143–154.

REFERENCES

1. Ankersmit F.R. Istoriya i tropologiya: vzlet i padenie metafory'. Moscow : *Progress–Tradiciya*, 2003. 496 s.
2. Ankersmit F. R. Narrativnaya logika. Semanticheskij analiz yazy'ka istorikov. Moscow : Ideya-press, 2003. 360 s.
3. Antologiy'a suchasnoyi anali'tichnoyi fi'losofi'yi, abo zhuk zalishaye korobku. Za naukovoju redakczi'yeyu A. S. Siniczi'. L'vi'v : Li'topis, 2014. 374 s.
4. Aron R. Lekczii po filosofii istorii: Kurs lekczij v Kollezhe de Frans. Moscow : *Knizhny'j dom LIBROKOM*, 2012. 335 s.
5. Domans'ka E. I'stori'ya ta suchasna gumani'taristika: dosli'dzhennya z teori'yi znannya pro minule. Kyiv : Ni'ka-czentr, 2012. 264 s.
6. Georg Iggers. Domanska E'. Filisofiya istorii posle postmodernizma. Moscow : "Kanon+" ; ROOI "Reabilitacziya", 2010. S. 148–166.

7. Khans Kyollner. Domanska E'. *Filosofiya istorii posle postmodernizma*. Moscow : "Kanon+" ; ROOI "Reabilitacziya", 2010. S. 62–101.
8. Ezhi Topol'ski. Domanska E'. *Filosofiya istorii posle postmodernizma*. Moscow : "Kanon+" ; ROOI "Reabilitacziya", 2010. S. 167–196.
9. Ankersmit F. *The Dilemma of Contemporary Anglo-Saxon Philosophy of History*. *History and Theory*. 1986. Vol. 25. № 4. P. 1–27.
10. Ankersmit F. *The Reality Effect in the Writing of History: The Dynamics of Historiographical Topology*. *Mededeling van de Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks*. Deel 52. № 1. Amsterdam, N.Y., 1989. P. 5–42.
11. Ankersmit F. *Historiography and Postmodernism*. *History and Theory*. 1989. Vol. 28. № 2. P. 137–153.
12. White H. *Introduction: Tropology, Discourse, and the Modes of Human Consciousness*. *Tropics of discourse: Essays in cultural criticism*. Baltimore; London : The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978. P. 1–25.
13. White H. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973. 350 p.
14. White H. *Historical Emplotment and the Problem of Truth*. *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the Final Solution*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1992. P. 143–154.

Родян Марія Володимирівна

старший викладач кафедри культурології
факультету історії та філософії

Одеського національного університету імені І. І. Мечникова
вул. Дворянська 2, м. Одеса, Україна

ІСТОРИЧНИЙ НАРАТИВ ЯК МЕТОДОЛОГІЯ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ МИНУЛОГО

У статті розглядається процес формування теорії історичного нарративу як методології дослідження минулого. Розглянутий зв'язок історичного нарративу із реальністю минулого та вплив суб'єкт-об'єктних відносин у процесі викладу істориком результатів свого дослідження. Прослідковується трансформація сприйняття теоретиками історичних нарративів проблеми зв'язку між текстом і реальністю минулого. Дослідження теорії історичного нарративу розпочинається із розгляду аналітичної традиції. Робиться акцент на логіко-дедуктивному елементі побудови істориком результатів своїх досліджень, розглядається специфіка сприйняття аналітиками цієї проблематики. Спираючись на досягнення аналітичної філософії історії, у статті проаналізовано постмодерну нарративістську теорію історії, розроблену американським дослідником Х. Уайтом. Вивчення цієї теорії розглядається у зв'язку з аналітичною традицією, прослідковуються спільні корені обох течій та визначаються відмінності між ними. Також увагу зосереджено на поетико-риторичному елементі історичного нарративу та питанні адекватності відображення реальності минулого в тексті історика. Як аналітична філософія історії, так і постмодерністські теорії історичної розповіді є результатом повороту до текстуалізму та конструктивізму в історії писемності.

Мета статті – аналіз компонентів теорії історичного нарративу другої половини ХХ – початку ХХІ століть.

Дослідження фокусується на генетично споріднених сферах методології та філософії дослідження минулого, які розкривають суть теорії історичної розповіді, та спробах її модифікувати. Оголошення відомостей про минуле, яке історик витягує з архівів, приречене на перетворення метафори, несвідомо обраної дослідником для поєднання результатів дослідження, зробило відстань між текстом та історичною реальністю непереборною. Історичну реальність з погляду нарративізму неможливо зобразити, а лише можна побудувати. Сподіваючись знайти шляхи, які б подолали метафоричне підкорення соціальної реальності, Ф. Анкерсміт розробив теорію, яка передбачає можливість отримання негайного досвіду минулого та його відображення, не пов'язаного з тропологією. Теорія, побудована на зовсім іншій від нарративізму парадигмі, була альтернативою текстуалізації реальності другої половини ХХ століття.

Ключові слова: історичний нарратив, теорія, постмодерн, метафора, аналітична теорія історії.