AESTHETIC FRAMES FROM TEXTS TO LITERARY WORKS – IN SEARCH OF "THE DIFFERENT" FOR THE ARTISTIC FATE

KHUNG THẨM MĨ TỪ VĂN BẢN ĐẾN TÁC PHẨM VĂN HỌC - MỘT SỰ TÌM KIẾM "CÁI KHÁC" CHO BẢN MỆNH NGHỆ THUẬT

Nguyen Thanh Truong[1], Phan Vi Phuong Uyen[2]

[1]*University of Education, The University of Da Nang; nttruong@ued.udn.vn*
[2]*Thanh Khe People's Committee, Danang City*

Tóm tắt - Việc định vị khung thẩm mĩ cho văn bản và tác phẩm văn học là hướng tới khám phá hình thái cấu trúc trong từng cấp độ nghệ thuật. Theo đó, từ văn bản đến tác phẩm là một quá trình liên kết/qui chiếu/đan xen của nhiều hình thức diễn ngôn.Tuy nhiên, nội hàm thẩm mĩ trong từng giao diện nghệ thuật lại đem đến những chỉ dấu không trùng khít.Tính chất khác biệt dựa trên cơ chế sinh thành khung tri thức thuộc về từng giai đoạn lịch sử của đối tượng là rộng hơn những gì lí thuyết tiếp nhận đã khuôn định.Vì thế, nhận diện khoảng cách thẩm mĩ ở mỗi hình thái bản mệnh nghệ thuật trên trục dẫn tri thức khung là hướng nghiên cứu cần thiết, góp phần xác lập thêm vai trò, chức năng cho văn bản và tác phẩm văn học.

Từ khóa - khung thẩm mĩ; văn bản; tác phẩm văn học; kí hiệu ngôn ngữ; bản mệnh nghệ thuật; lí thuyết tiếp nhận.

Abstract - The location of aesthetic frames for texts and literary works is oriented towards discovering structural forms in every artistic level. Accordingly, the process from texts to literary works interweaves/coheres with/refers to various forms of discourse. However, the aesthetic connotation of each artistic interface results in some non-coincident cues. Different characteristics based on the formative mechanism of a knowledge frame in each historical period related to a subject are more extensive than those moulded by the theory of receptivity. Therefore, identifying an aesthetic distance in each form of art's fate on the axis of frame knowlege is a research approach of great necessity, which contributes to the establishment of additional roles and functions for texts and literary works.

Key words - aesthetic frame; text; literary work; linguistic sign; artistic fate; receptivity theory.

1. Introduction

In the view of modern theoretical thinking, twin nature in both structures of texts and literary works originates from practical and sign values. However, the connotation of value in each form of art brings back non-coincident cues. Distinction based on the mechanism for expressing subject meaning in each historical period is broader than what has been moulded by the theory of relativity. Therefore, defining aesthetic frame knowledge from texts to literary works in the interface of the fate of words/meanings is oriented towards the location of the existence of these two aspects in open limits, which reside in many *receptive ranges* of the flow of literary life.

2. Research Content

2.1. From texts'aestheic frame

Literary texts are constructed by means of an art-specific structure model in which every form of text organization always corresponds to an aesthetic frame. From this character there emerges a text formed on the primary and essential axis ofthe creator's awareness. Here art elements are structuralized based on intentional and unintentional lead networks. Its primitive nature, which came into being through the subjective lens of its subjects and was deeply attached to language material bearing sign character, has verified potential fiction copyright in text structures. The function of extending these organs provide text with certain power – assertivenessin the depth of the subject's nature. As a result, "a literary text is a collection of language signs with its own life and semantic power." [7, p.272]. The range of existing components not only includes form-based sets but also represents many value frames. The operational mechanism of language-thinking is processed via many "deep-structure" complexes, bringing potential capacities to layers of signs. Also, in the

cues of information-communication forms, language signs are capable of creating their own meaning "according to their own laws" [4, p.47] wherein the implicatures of referential forms [meanings provided by the sign system] in cognitiveness/ characterization have built up an aesthetic field for texts. The process of forming new meaning-sense is the one in which the subject supplies the language with cohesion in interwoven relations of many discourse forms wherein the primary meanings in the connotation of language signs are no longer confined to many boundaries of specialized "dictionaries"/ reality refractions. khúc xạ hiện thực. Instead, marginal information/antithesis has overwhelmed intrinsic words/meanings. Formative symbiosis has urged language signs/ images marginalized in primary meaings to surpass their own structures and erode opposite semantic fields to modellize many aesthetic social relations inside and outside texts. Accordingly, "each word, apart from its meaning, its naming of objects, suddenly bursts out itself, extends, attracts unexpected images and emotions, generates an area of light (…). Each word is like a burning candle; candles arranged side by side create a joint area of light" [4, p.71]. This property proves that art language signs always fosters its own fusion of utterance/discourse power of image-based thinking. That is to say, the language of literary texts is not identical with language used in common communication but it is the langugae of art that employs language signs to form distances in the flow of meaning-sense. In other words, the property of endophora embedded potentially in the form of language signs functions as a catalyst that evokes sources of overwhelming emotionsfor the minds and souls of those who are appreciating the texts. Therefore, in the process of reflecting and extracting ideas, aesthetic emotions in the realm of formative words/meaning [under the form of

supersubject], the creative subject has established art quality of the texts.

On the other hand, within the limited frame of literary texts, abstractness functions as a default property in the nature of signs, which do not lie outside the capability of orientating towards the establishment of a system of signs based on art rules. The institution of signs is not confined to the level of language but extended to the level of encoding images whereby layers of art language signs always play medium roles, which is demonstrated through corresponding layers of meaningamagamated on an axis: the signifier and the signified are capable of providing information about a scope of life reality. The property of conformity that belongs to the historical nature of language has brought classification to the normal sign system and the art sign system. Moreover, the formation of texts on the genre axis is always based on the following principle: the form comes into being on the basis of discourse organizations that belong to the aim of language art;the content dwells onthe object demonstrated through conventional discourse organizations in whichdiscourse nature will determine the status and artistic quality of text layers. However, whether these discourse organizations really become axes of aesthetic ideology or not depends much on the decision-making role of the subject. The creative subject in idea generation needs to meet with the receptive subject in expectation. The whole process of interaction between subject roles ranges from idea formation to the birth of the spiritual child in the fate of texts. As a result, all potential values for the signifier and the signified at discourse levels need to be combined with the spiritual awareness of the subject. Hence, the subject is a bridge between touching areas inside and outside a text [the realm of language includes discourse forms; the scope of objects belong to life]. All operational mechanisms depend on aesthetic awareness in the frame of art thinking of the subject in which intersection is placed in strategic interaction. This property has stimulated language sign quality to exist in texts that bear features of metalanguages.

Locating a text from language sign conventions to what belongs to value conventions is a process of identifying the nature of an object that does not follow one-way programming. What matters is that reality and text belong to two value frames. A text is greatly impacted by its creator's intention - the creative subject who writes about occurrences in the life of a text which is more or less imprinted on the surface of the text due to the subject's intention. Therefore, texts are always a matter of concern to readers who are in the mood of receiving messages sent by writers, but texts are not so comprehensive as expected and do not satisfy all related requirements. Unrealistic reception is undeniable, for the nature of texts are"fictional". This default feature appears, forming on the peripheral axis of speech – discourse organizations in texts that are initially assigned aesthetic features by the creative subject. This implicitly acknowleges single properties in sign layers on a text which is supposed to have been completed as the artist finished writing the last page. However, this is only an initial value [all values that

connect language signs together inside a text are always representations of primary meaning. That is to say, what the writer has created via the channel of language material is only an incomplete or unfinished product of programming. Consequently, the utterances of creative subjects cannot be identical with those of subjects as objects.

In literary texts, creative subjects are always aware of quantifying a certain distance to communicative contexts. Filling this are sequences of strategic utterances by speakers [narrators/ characters/ lyrical images…] created by creative subjects. This form occurs in texts for the purpose of explaining certain communicative activities. That distinct characteristic proves that all relations in life that take place in the aesthetic frame always exist, grow in a world of imagination – an extended product of art games in which all fictional links have asserted the aesthetic depth of literary texts distinguished from pragmatic ones. Literary texts are home to the world of art. This world has been built up on the foundation of language art [made up from a system of signs/ markings/ art codes]. The conformity on the axis of language-thinking is started on many levels: images – ideas – symbols – hidden symbols – legendary symbols. The subject's creative power has verified the copyright of the superstatus subject that projects the creative ego with a strong personality in "reality restructuring" – provides language signs with aesthetic power in building a world of images. In other words, the structure of images existing in texts in distinctive.And on the foundation of discourse organizations – lrimary language and secondary language [meta language] came a world of art operating on many slices of the aesthetic space, not just merely a "reflection" of objects.

The problem of managing to identify meaning layers in texts requires the establishment of a value schema. There is no denying that there are obstacles in following the system of frame theory thinking, for there is more than one text layer involving more than one relation responsible for its formation. One noticeable point in identifying frame knowledge elements that build up power for texts is to localize non-central discourse organizations, i.e. "peripheralization, or opening borders, *crossing borders* (…). Reading literature is also a process of peripheralization."[3, p.335], which is orientated towards establishing dialogue structures based on criteria of levelsof aesthetic code – signs including many layers of meaning via coordinate axes constructing images and scope of contact, thereby forming a network of aesthetic power. Accordingly, the communication and transmission property of language signals–aesthetic code/ signs has proved that from reality to text is a process. This is the process of handling/interpretating reality by the subjectwhen allocating the sign system the first identity card in art life interface wherein systems of aesthetic signals – aesthetic art codes accumulate/absorb each other in many "open" spaces have formed discourse organizations that exist/reside in many unspecified spots that belong to structures in side and outside texts. This

characteristic has involved/ explained aesthetic social relations that form value fields for many text interfaces. Therefore, the issue of meaning/sense always include fragments penetrating through text spirit. It is made up from countless realtions/interactions with both the front and the back of a text. The nature of each meaning is located based on themes/topics/thoughts/inspirations and aesthetic forms are structural nuclei that form the aestheic frame for the fate of art.

To sum up, the formation of the knowledge frame for texts is a process whereby the aesthetic subject reestablishes more than one art paths. In terms of their forms, texts must generate innumerable variable functions among the waves of language. In terms of their spirit, texts form an operational mechanism for signs/markings in their perfect whole quality. This distance shows many differences that accounts for no absolute coincidence between a text frame and reality. Because reality is an intersection point for all initial contacts, which belongs to objects. Texts lie in the reference area of sign/marking layers – forms/meanings are provided by interaction between transcendent subjects and objects of reflection. Among these, the spirit and consciousness of the subjects belong to the subjective. Nature-based properties have focalized the journey to seek discourse meaning for texts in many open interfaces. As claimed by Nguyễn Văn Trung, "What was not written down is what is meant to say"[6, p.67]. This proves that aesthetic ideas are distilled in the depths of semantic partition that lie in front of and at the back of texts. Moreover, the issue of text knowledge frame is not merely a form of endophora of words/meanings, but it has thrived and survived through many new steps in identifying, determining meaning/sense via the discovery of potential values in the institutional corridor from the texts' aesthetic frame to the works.

2.2. ... to the aesthetic frame of literary texts

The birth of literature reception theory has brought about radical changes in the thinking map in terms of viewing artistic texts from readers' reception. At the same time, the distinction of existence forms of "texts" and "works" has indicated limits in their aesthetic frame knowledge. Texts form a system of organizing signs created for readers, which came into being prior to reading activity. Works are products of a process of receiving texts which exist in readers' consciousness. Therefore, modern theoretical thinking has established structural forms of the works on the axes – texts. That is to say, works are products that generate and create meanings of texts – a vivid process-based artistic world. Its meaning – sense is expanded indefinitely thanks to readers' activeness and originality. Hence, in the works' aesthetic frame "from the smallest meaning readers can approach the greatest meaning of the works, but this is identical with the greatest value of the works. Accordingly, we find it hard to reach the goal of approaching literary texts as they are"[1, p.32]. This makes sense to each spiritual product that needs more than just a process of colliding with new dialogues shaping values, which are reading and post-reading processes. Researching into the relation of independent development

in close association with reading shows that the fate of an artistic text is always built up by innumerable "gaps". As a matter of course, through the reading activity, aesthetic experiences are to fill in those gaps. Enlightening any value area of a text depends greatly on reading levels and the text only appears in its proper form when it encounters an ideal level of interpretation. In the institution of the perception map, it is not easy for reading to meet, match and satisfy all expectations from readers. The reason lies in the distinction concerning some aesthetic distance/aesthetic experience between perception subjects. This leads to considerable hindrance to the way towards the identification of the artistic fate

In the reality of perception, works always appear in various visions; their historical fates conform to many reading facets/fields. If readers can grasp expectations from texts, much of the intention of the creative subject can be thoroughly understood via the giving-receiving mechanism. At this time, the intentionality and the axis extending from text structures works experience little disorder. All mechanisms for creating meaning provided by authors will flourish in a one-way context. On the contrary, the perception subject does not unintentionally take notice of expectations from texts/ look in another direction/ break through form structure/ seek new values in the object fate; as a result, the artistic intention of the creative subject is far from meaning interfaces induced by the perceptive subject. Without interaction, there would be collisions/ clashes that divide reading into two directions [readers will have no chances to go through texts to touch the spiritual fates of works, or readers will surpass the "autonomy" limit that belongs to layers of markings in texts] to be in parallel with the creative subject in artistic games. Therefore, interaction between text codes [sender's code –receiver's code] in subjective power will establish/form boundaries of peripheralization, thereby enabling the creation of a link that extends the text and touches the aesthetic frame of the work.

Following texts, derived texts are also concretization of text interpretation through the spiritual life of readers. At this time, works belong to a converse direction in reading effects. The works do not get to satisfy their creators. All comparisons between texts and works fail to discover areas of meaning in the same situation. The indefinite capacity of language - via discourse organizations has opened more than one inherent explanation of life reality. As Umberto Eco stated, "Openess is a condition for all aesthetic enjoyments, and any enjoyment form, if bearing aesthetic value, is open" [1, p.34]. Upwards, the aesthetic value frame form texts to works only take place in sublimate emotions, in a strong desire to look for what belongs to the subject's creative thinking. That is to say, the birth and existence of a value frame does not mean the freezing of all values. The incomplete accumulation of texts in the perceptive subject will destroy all of their autonomy limits, creating aesthetic frames of works.

In summary, aesthetic frames of works must be means of transporting the process of reviving text meaning, providing a reason for the existence of text meaning. There,

in the process of conceiving and giving birth to the artistic fate, only the creative subject can be fully aware of how the life of the artistic foetus has been constructed. Consequently, perceiving an artistic text can be considered as a journey of encoding the process of art formation. If creative ideas are only a schleroma block no work will come into being, or there will be no sublimate moments for creating artistic texts of bitch is there is no process of fostering and accelerating creativity drives. Only creativity drives that generate from all subject interfaces are factors that contribute to genuine aesthetic value frames for works.

2.3. ... a search for "the different" for the artistic fate

From the viewpoint of modern theories, there have been changes in thinking about the aesthetic frames of texts. The previous viewpoint, which is visual and simplistic, has assigned spiritual values to works and implicitly included all objective meanings provided by their owners, which can be sought and discovered by readers. And depending on their knowledge, readers will be able to collect values that inherently exist in the artistic fate. However, together with the appearance of the open perceptive thinking, the meanings of literary texts are not subject to stability but they are links to many relations based on processes which do not rely on the only meanings resulting from dependence on language sign layers but occur seamlessly on the cutting facet of the interactional axis inside and outside texts, attaching to specific cycles of perceptive activity. Accordingly, "with classes of intangible words that implicitly contain various meanings, which is subject to constant change and impossible for localization, literary works have their own modes of existence"[2, p.311]. This feature is orientated towards the cognition of the process of forming the artistic fate which is always associated with time quality and the incomplete intersection contact range for the life cycle of a work. That is to say, the importance/the meaning interface of a work depends on the selection of time and anticipates explanation from receivers. This shows that modern theoretical thinking does not concentrate on the conception of the uniqueness of a text, for it does not record language autonomy of a work as an object/language. Accordingly, a work is viewed in the stimulation of text-intertext networks. That artistic world is always open in unlimited interational/imaginary fields, impossible for structuralization and synchronization; at the same time, it serves as a base for literary texts to create links between central and peripheral texts wherein the appearance of readers in dialogue/ interpretation of implicit layers of meaning makes texts really enter the stage of transforming into aesthetic objects of the subjects – some creative transformation in the thinking of the perceptive subject. At this time, indefinite features in the artistic fate are determined in many semantic partitions of language waves [layers of artistic code]. Not confined to its expectation, the perceptive subject becomes a centre that brings values to the life cycle of a text. Of course the existence of a work as an aesthetic object only comes after the text has been read. This appearance lies in the control

of both intentional and unintentional reading with an awareness of directing towards the destruction of the unity of senses and images. This proves that modern theoretical thinking does not give prominence to the role of "subjectivization" for the meaning of works. The meaning frame of a literary work only appears when located in an open space between the text and its receiver, thereby forming a relation between the text and its readers who "experience the work".

On this basis we realize that language signs no longer have their meaning stability – primary meanings imprinted on texts are blurred/ rejected/ even make room for semantic fields that are newly derived from the need of readers' consciousness. Coming back to its origin, the mechanism that gives birth to all meaning values in works are not static in the dimension of idealizing reality/non-transparency on the surface of notions. The existence of genuine values that belong to characteristic nature needed in each artistic fate only occurs in the consciousness of integrating intentional and unintentional acts from creative subjects and perceptive subjects. Activities that generate instructions from texts to literary works are always two-way interactional processes in the relation: reality-writer-text-reader-work. As a result, the aesthetic frame from texts to works only exist when there is appearnce of many facets/fields of reading.

3. Conclusion

If texts are initial contact areas which are primary, texts lie in extension areas of secondary meanings, which are generated by interaction among subject roles. Identifying the distances of specific values in each artistic interface means orientation towards the establishment of an aesthetic frame for text fates and works. Therefore, from texts to works is a process of cohesion/reference which is artistically strategic. There, knowledge frame in texts and works always interact in creative power, which belongs to consciousness of artistic thinking of subjects. These tokens prove that all knowledge frames generate, exist without their values being frozen. And it is the incomplete part of texts' aesthetic frames have destroyed all borders on axes leading to works' aesthetic frames.

REFERENCES

[1] Trương Đăng Dung (1998), *From Texts to Literary Works*, Social Sciences Publishing House, Ha Noi.

[2] Trương Đăng Dung (2004), *Literary Works as Processes,* Social Sciences Publishing House, Ha Noi.

[3] Trần Đình Sử (2016), *On Boundaries of Literary Theories*, Women Publishing House, Ha Noi.

[4] Nguyễn Đình Thi (2001), *Some Thoughts on Poetry*, Essays, Notes. Literature Publishing House, Ha Noi.

[5] Hoài Trinh (1980), *On Science and Art in Literary Criticism,* Social Sciences Publishing House, Ha Noi.

[6] Nguyễn Văn Trung (1963) *An Overview of Literature 1*, Nam Sơn Publishing House. Sai Gon.

[7] Viện văn học (2005), *Theory and Literary Criticism – Renovation and Development* (Workshop Proceedings), Social Sciences Publishing House, Ha Noi.