SOME COGNITIVE MODELS AS POSSIBLE FUZZY STRATEGIES OF EMINESCU'S WORK RECEPTION

NARCIS ZĂRNESCU

Abstract. In this study, we are aiming to find an interpretation of a poetic text (Eminescu's poetry) on the basis of cognitive models of verbal poetic images. If the poetic images constitute the dominant of a poetic text and that the functions of textual elements are regulated by cognitive mechanisms, we'll try to demonstrate by our hypothesis that in the deep structures of the poetic text exists a program of its interpretation, fuzzy strategies and tactics in order to correlate the text semantics with the subjective and communicative knowledge.

Keywords: meaning, cognitive semantics, situated agent, schema, distinguishing criterion

Eminescu has been interpreted under multiple hermeneutic horizons, but never before from the perspective of the theory of cognitive neuroscience, cognitive linguistics or prototypical semantics. Cognitive poetics is the study of literary reading. Using Ingarden's distinction[1], literary texts are *autonomous objects*, having a material existence in the world, but literature is a *heteronomous object*, existing only when activated and engaged by the animating consciousness of the reader[2]. The research in cognitive neuroscience will both precipitate and necessitate a shift in the underlying theories of cognition and education in much the same sense as that proposed by Kuhn (1970). Cognitive linguistics has contributed to firmly anchor language in its mental, corporeal, social and environmental contexts. Classical and semiotic notions such as, for instance, categories, metaphors, iconicity, and style have been critically assessed and radically redefined in a way that foregrounds their centrality, and new notions have emerged such as mental space, collocation, prototypes, scripts and schemas, and text worlds, to name only a few. It is clear by the other hand that the conception of the mind as a serial Von Neumann computer is not confirmed by contemporary research findings in psychology and neuroscience, that existing theories of cognition may not map well on to the neurological processes of thought[3], and that new models of cognition are emerging[4]. Other authors (such as Berninger & Winn; Egan, 2002; Klahr & Nigam, 2004; Mayer, 2004; Ravitch, 2000) are thinking that cognitive neuroscience research can contribute to confirming or disconfirming evidence to support either traditional perspectives or revolutionary ones.

Several literary theorists and critics have been producing work through a dialogue with more fields within cognitive science: artificial intelligence, cognitive

---

[1] Roman Ingarden, *Das literarische Kunstwerk.* Trans. George Grabowics (1973). *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature*, Evanston, IL, Northwestern University Press. 1973, 1931.

[2] Peter Stockwell, *Cognitive Poetics. An introduction*. New York, Routledge, 2002, p. 165.

[3] J. A. Fiez, "Bridging the gap between neuroimaging and neuropsychology: Using working memory as a case-study" in *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 23, 2001, pp. 19-31.

[4] See M. Atherton, "A neurocognitive model for students and educators" in *Cognitive Science Society*, Fairfax, VA, 2002 and M. Atherton, "Applying the neurosciences to educational research: can cognitive neuroscience bridge the gap?" part I.. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Educational Research Association*, Montréal, Canada, 2005.