

Michailas Vinogradovas

Vilnius University

Muitinès 8, 3000 Kaunas, Lithuania

Tel.: (370 – 7) 422344

THE NOTIONS OF “SCHEMATA” AND “SCHEMAS” IN THE STUDY OF LITERARY FICTIONS

Schema theory in contemporary cognitive psychology (R. P. Abelson, D. E. Rumelhart, R. C. Schank) and artificial intelligence (M. Minsky, C. J. Fillmore, T. Winograd) deals with the organization of human knowledge. ‘Image schema’, introduced and developed in cognitive semantics (M. Johnson, G. Lakoff, M. Turner), is practically a cognitive tool based on metaphorization whereby features of a source cognitive domain (vehicle) are mapped onto a target cognitive domain (tenor) to present complex entities in terms of simpler ones. The relation between ‘schema theory’ and ‘image schema’ is that of hyponymy: the former is the superordinate while the latter is a hyponym since ‘image schema’ is only one of the possible species of Schank’s Thematic Organization Points. Thus the difference in the plural forms of ‘schema theory’ and ‘image schema’, ‘schemata’ and ‘schemas’ respectively, reflects the difference between these notions. G. Cook’s notion of ‘schema refreshment’ through discourse deviation is considered as the pivotal property of literariness. ‘Schema refreshment’ is grounded on metaphorization: evoking novel relationships between conflicting schemata in literary texts and discourse deviation leads to reconceptualization of the actual world. Cook’s notion of ‘schema reinforcement’, when discourse deviation does not engender deviations in background assumptions, helps to understand better the ‘incompleteness’ (L. Dolezel) of fictional worlds in literary texts. ‘Schema reinforcement’ may involve metaphorization, but it is usually of the ‘image schema’ type. The ‘schema theory’ approach also shows that the construction of new worlds in literary texts is based not on various kinds of similarities among different schemata but on the substitution of a schema for a completely new one. In sum, the contemporary notion of schema, which is not only the product of cross – fertilization of different academic disciplines but also of intercultural character, can be usefully applied to literary studies, especially in the analysis of the epistemological and ontological entities of fictional worlds created by literary texts.

KEY WORDS: associative / Gestalt psychology, background / prior knowledge, cognition, fictional / new world, image schema, knowledge structure, linguistic deviation / patterning, literariness, literary text, metaphor, metaphorization, reconceptualization, scene, schema (refreshment / reinforcement / theory), script, source / target domain, tenor, vehicle, world view.

A seemingly simple question, rather often put to me by my students: *Is the plural of schema ‘schemas’ or ‘schemata’?* gives rise to many questions since the concept of schema represents one of the latest fundamental developments in the Anglo-American contemporary cognitive psychology, artificial intelligence, sociolinguistics, natural language semantics / philosophy, to mention some of the disciplines that use this concept. For reasons of space I shall deal only with three questions the answers to which, I hope, will help to reply to the students’ question:

1. Are the differences in the plural forms of 'schema' tied up with the differences in meaning between the collocations 'schema theory' and 'image schema'?

2. What is the methodological (epistemological) status of the concepts of schema theory and image schema in literary studies?

3. Are the concepts of schema theory and image schema really novel developments and innovations in literary studies?

It is quite natural that the answer to the second question precedes the answer to the first one, and it is impossible to answer the third question without at least short overview of the origin and development of the term 'schema' itself.

From the very start I should like to stress that the term 'schema' in this study will refer only to mental representations of knowledge. The remark is expedient for the term may have other applications. For instance, Louis Hjelmslev uses 'schema' in glossematics to denote 'pure form' in language, and 'schematization' may stand for verbal patterning¹.

The origin of modern schema theory is usually traced back to the Cambridge psychologist F. C. Bartlett², who, in his turn, attributes the notion of schema to the neuro-physiologist H. Head³. (For a detailed review of the origins and development of schema theory see⁴). Bartlett maintains that perception, understanding and memory are shaped by the expectations that people form on the basis of their prior knowledge. In the forty years that followed Bartlett's ideas had hardly any impact on schema theory due to the dominance of behaviourism and psychoanalysis. It was only in the 1970s that schema theory gained a central position as a model of human knowledge. Over the last few decades, schema theory has developed as a result of the ongoing cross-fertilization between speculations on the nature of human cognition and attempts to stimulate human intelligence by machine. Its range of application includes a wide variety of areas, such as anthropology, story processing, second and foreign language teaching, semantic theory, language acquisition and neurolinguistics.

The adoption of schema-based models of comprehension by cognitive psychologists and computer scientists has led to proliferation of the term 'schemata' when 'schema' is the most general label for knowledge structures. The term 'scenario' is also used to refer to cognitive representations in semantic memory. 'Frame' and 'script' coined by computer scientists have also gained currency: the former, introduced by Minsky (1975), refers to stereotypical knowledge about settings and situations used in visual perception (e. g. knowledge about different types of rooms); the latter, introduced by Schank and Abelson⁵, refers to knowledge about sequences of related actions used in the comprehension of complex events (e. g. knowledge about going to a restaurant). Sometimes all these terms are used as an alternative to 'schema'.

¹ NOWOTTNY, W. *The language poets use*. New York, 1962, ch. 6.

² BARTLETT, F. C. *Remembering: a study in experimental and social psychology*. Cambridge, 1932.

³ HEAD, H. *Studies in neurology*. Oxford, 1920.

⁴ SEMINO, E. *Language and world creation in poems and other texts*. New York, 1997, ch. 6.

⁵ SCHANK, R. C.; ABELSON, R. *Scripts, plans, goals and understanding*. Hillsdale, N. J, 1977.

At present it is possible to speak about three basic versions of schema theory: represented by schemata in Rumelhart's theory of cognition⁶, Schank and Abelson's typology of schemata⁷, and Schank's dynamic theory of cognition⁸. They can be considered versions for, despite different terminologies, the essential properties of the theories mostly coincide. Schank and Abelson's script consists of slots which in Rumelhart's schema are called variables. The requirements concerning the kind of entities that can fill these slots or variables are also practically the same. For example, the RESTAURANT script / schema includes 'roles' (waiter, cook, cashier, etc.), 'props' (tables, menus, food, etc.), entry conditions (wanting to eat, etc.), results (not very hungry, etc.), scenes (entering, ordering, eating, etc.). An ORDERING in a RESTAURANT scene may have different scripts: for instance, for fast-food restaurant compared with a traditional restaurant. To accommodate the hierarchal relations between scripts, scenes or actions and settings Schank uses a higher memory structure – a MOP (Memory Organization Packet) which organizes scenes. For example, MOP-AIRPORT contains the following scenes: PLAN+GET MONEY+CALL AIRLINE+GET TICKETS+DRIVE TO AIRPORT+CHECK IN+WAITING AREA + BOARDING+FLYING+DEPLANING. In addition to MOPs Schank introduces TOPs (Thematic Organization Points) – high-level memory structures that highlight similarities and parallels between different areas of knowledge. Schank is deeply convinced that the ability to draw parallels across different domains is a central feature of human intelligence, and it plays a central role in human comprehension, reasoning and learning. Schank uses, for example, the notion of TOP to explain how in 1979 President Carter could propose a parallel between the behaviour of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan and that of Nazi Germany in pre-war Europe. Perceiving such similarities has momentous implications for the predictions of possible outcomes, the planning of future behaviour and the general notion that we can learn from history. Schank also claims that TOPs can explain our understanding of abstract concepts, such as 'imperialism' in terms of sets and goals, conditions and themes⁹. Fictional texts can also be interpreted in terms of TOPs as it is done, for example, by L. Semino with respect to the fable by Aesop *A Lesson For Fools* which tells us about a crow with meat sitting on a tree and a fox who manages to get hold of the meat. The moral of the fable is that giving in to flattery can have unpleasant consequences. The fable applies generally to situations that involve similar goals (a person A wants an object X), similar conditions (another person B has possession of X), similar plans (A flatters B) and similar features (A is cunning, B is naive)¹⁰.

Thus the essence of 'schema theory', in very general terms, is connected with the models of the organization of human knowledge. The theory itself is considered to have been developed in cognitive psychology and artificial intelligence. The term 'schema' in this theory stands for a portion of prior knowledge, and its plural form 'schemata' naturally corresponds to the areas of

⁶ RUMELHART, D. E. Schemata: the building blocks of cognition. In *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension: perspectives from cognitive psychology, linguistics, artificial intelligence and education*. Hillsdale, N J, 1980, p. 33 – 58; RUMELHART, D. E. Schemata and the cognitive system. In *Handbook of social cognition*. Hillsdale, N J, 1984, p. 161 – 188.

⁷ SCHANK, nuoroda 5.

⁸ SCHANK R. C. *Dynamic memory: a theory of reminding and learning in computers and people*. Cambridge, 1982.

⁹ SCHANK, nuoroda 8.

¹⁰ SEMINO, nuoroda 4, p. 147.

background knowledge. The basic tenet of cognitive psychology and artificial intelligence is that comprehension depends on the availability and activation of relevant prior knowledge, i. e. on recalling of prior situations, objects, people, and events. The content of schemata, therefore, will vary from individual to individual. For example, the schema GOING TO THE THEATRE alongside common features will also contain some differences due to different prior knowledge connected with going to the theatre of concrete individual.

The activation of schemata allows us to make predictions and to draw references in the process of comprehension. Thus, according to schema theory, meanings are not contained within the text, but are constructed in the interaction between the text and the interpreter's background knowledge. This tenet actually serves as a basis for the methodological foundation of the so-called reader-response theory. The proportions of the reader's involvement into the interpretation of a text in terms of schema theory depends on two factors. First, it is determined by the amount of semantic memory, i. e. schemata as perceived by people in general, and also of episodic memory, i. e. information of mainly individual character. Secondly, it is determined by the way the processing of information is driven: whether it is driven by the text itself – the bottom – up or stimulus – driven processing, or by only the interpreter's prior knowledge – the top – down or conceptually – driven processing. In both cases the matter is of emphasis: whether texts project worlds or readers construct worlds.

The notion of image schema represents the Cognitive View of metaphor¹¹ and deals with the trasferral of features of the source domain (vehicle) to the target domain (tenor). The mapping of one whole domain into another is primarily needed to present complex, abstract notions in terms of simpler, concrete ones. The basic tenet of this view is that metaphor is a pervasive cognitive tool that plays a central role in the way in which we structure our experience and conceptualize the reality we live in. Metaphorical connections arise from the perception of correlations between different types of experience, but they can also make us see new correspondences or attribute new properties to objects, concepts, and situations. The Cognitive View highlights the centrality of metaphor to our ordinary conceptual system. Most of these metaphors are grounded in a number of basic 'image-schemas', i. e. in the patterns that emerge from our experience of our own bodies, our spatial orientation and movements, and our physical perceptions – we use familiar domains to understand more abstract and complex domains. A lot of fascinating work has been done in this field by the well-known North American linguists Johnson¹², Lakoff¹³, Turner¹⁴. They established the following main types of cognitive metaphors: ORIENTATIONAL metaphors that express the positive – negative polarity representing, for example, the UP – DOWN opposition (*I am in high spirits* vs *I'm feeling down today*); ONTOLOGICAL metaphors when emotions, events, etc. are turned into physical objects – THE MIND IS A MACHINE (*My mind is not operating today*); CONDUIT metaphors

¹¹ JOHNSON, M. *The body in the mind: the bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reason*. Chicago, 1987; LAKOFF, G.; TURNER, M. *More than good reason: a field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago, 1989.

¹² JOHNSON, nuoroda 11.

¹³ LAKOFF, G. Linguistic gestalts. In *Papers from the Thirteenth Regional Meetings*. Chicago, 1977, p. 236 – 287; LAKOFF, nuoroda 11.

¹⁴ TURNER, M. *Death is the mother of beauty: mind, metaphor, criticism*. Chicago, 1987.

when thoughts and ideas are objects and linguistic expressions for them are containers (*I can't put my feelings into words*); STRUCTURAL metaphors representing cultural and social experiences (LIFE IS A JOURNEY, ARGUMENT IS WAR).

A short overview of the concepts 'schema theory' and 'image schema' makes it possible to answer the first and the third questions put at the beginning of the paper. The relation between the terms 'schema theory' and 'image schema' is that of hyponymy: the first being the superordinate and the latter is a hyponym. There are other hyponyms that can be included into this superordinate, e. g. script, scene, MOP, etc. The notion of image schema implies that two different domains of knowledge are compared. In this respect 'image schema' is a kind of TOP, but in contrast to it 'image schema' presupposes a connection between different knowledge structures based inclusively on metaphorization, while in TOPS metaphorization is only one of possible ways of connecting different knowledge structures. It follows that it is justified to use the plural form 'schemata' to denote knowledge structures in general, and the plural form 'schemas' to refer to the conflation of different knowledge structures based only on metaphorization.

The notion of schema as a mental representation or a 'structure of the mind' goes back at least to I. Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* (1787). The contemporary conception of schema as a knowledge structure practically corresponds to the notion of gestalt in Gestalt psychology which denotes a functional structure that determines the properties and function of its parts. Though, as a scientific discipline, Gestalt psychology appeared in the first decades of the 20th century, it was initiated by the category of intentionality as developed by F. Brentano, E. Husserl, and A. Meinong at the end of the 19th century. In 1950s the structuration of knowledge from psychology was borrowed into anthropology (C. Levi-Strauss), and in 1960s into history (M. Foucault), literature and semiotics (R. Barthes, A. J. Greimas, T. Todorov). But the primacy, at least chronologically, of the structuration of knowledge, as borrowed from psychology, belongs to the Russian formalists who used this notion in literary studies at the very beginning on the 20th century.

The influence of Gestalt psychology on the development of 'image schema' is not concealed by its creators: one of the works in this field by Lakoff is called *Linguistic Gestalts*¹⁵. In fact, to claim that Johnson, Lakoff, and Turner pioneered the notion of image schema would not be completely correct. As far back as in 1962 W. Nowotny contrasted the notions of verbal schemes (schematization) and structure of reality (conceptual schemata)¹⁶ and used the latter for the analysis of metaphor *Afternoon burns upon the wires of the sea*. The idea of the existing connection between the physical and the mental in relation to the source and target domains cannot be considered as novel either. For instance, Kenneth Pike maintains that any mental activity correlates with physical activity since there are non-verbal universals that determine verbal ones¹⁷. On the whole the notions of source and target domains and the features that are mapped from the latter onto the former do not differ from the traditional ones employed for the description of metaphor: tenor, vehicle, ground. At first glance it seems that the notions of tenor,

¹⁵ LAKOFF, nuoroda 13.

¹⁶ NOWOTNY, nuoroda 1, p. 142.

¹⁷ PIKE, K. L. Here we stand creative observers of language. *Approaches du language: publications de la Sorbonne. Serie „Etudes”*, Paris, 1980, t. 16, p. 9 – 45.

vehicle, ground are used to describe separate objects, while the notion of domains involves conceptual fields. But this impression is deceptive. In the condensed form the comparison of domains produces the same semantic equation as the equation represented by tenor and vehicle. Lakoff and Johnson's *LIFE IS A JOURNEY* does not differ in this sense from Black's *MAN IS A WOLF* which also presupposes the comparison of two domains: 'man' stands for all humans and 'wolf' represents wild animals. The difference is in the direction of metaphorization: in image schema it goes from the general to the particular, while in traditional theories of metaphor the process is reverse – from the particular to the general. But the result is the same: in both cases we have metaphorical equation verbally represented by separate words. The difference in the direction of metaphorization is due to the differences in the theoretical frameworks applied to the interpretation of metaphor: 'image schema' is based on Gestalt psychology, and the traditional conception of metaphor is grounded on Associative psychology whose principle idea of apperception presupposes *Tertium Comparationis*.

The customary areas of application of schema theory to contemporary literary studies are the following: the study of story processing¹⁸, the interpretation of literary texts in general¹⁹, the establishment of literariness of verbal texts²⁰. I will consider at large the last issue since it is directly connected with the epistemology of fictions. There are various approaches to the definition of literariness based on schema theory. For instance, R. de Beaugrand explains literariness in terms of the notion of a special high-order *ALTERNATION* schema²¹, and J. J. Weber²² uses for this purpose the notion of negative and positive manipulation'. I shall use for this purpose Cook's theoretical framework not only because it somehow epitomizes the essentials of the doctrines of literariness founded on schema theory, but mainly because Cook's framework is most helpful in answering the second question put at the beginning of the presentation. In this respect two Cook's notions are of the most importance: the notion of 'schema refreshment' and the notion of 'schema reinforcement'.

According to Cook, schema theory can provide a framework to account for the interaction between language and structure of texts, on the one hand, and the readers' prior knowledge, on the other hand; and literariness can be defined through this interaction. It typically arises when deviations at the level of language and text pose a challenge to the reader's schemata (schema disruption), and they result in schema change (schema refreshment). Schema refreshment is a complex phenomenon and is looked upon by Cook as discourse deviation. By means of this approach Cook proposes an explanation as to why other texts, for example advertisements, are not literary even if they display linguistic deviation and patterning. The reason is that in ads linguistic experimentation does not lead to deviations at the level of the background knowledge. Cook's analysis shows that deviation in ads strengthens in different ways the existing schemata or reinforces them. Schema reinforcement either confirms existing schemata (schema preserving) or provides new information about the advertised product,

¹⁸ RUMELHART, ižnaša 6.

¹⁹ TSUR, R. *Towards a theory of cognitive poetics*. Amsterdam, 1992.

²⁰ COOK, G. *Discourse and literature*. Oxford, 1994.

²¹ BEAUGRAND de, R. Schemas for literary communication. In *Literary Discourse*. Berlin, 1987, p. 49 – 99.

²² WEBER, J. J. *Critical analysis of fiction*. Amsterdam, 1992.

which can be easily incorporated within existing schemata (schema adding). As Cook himself holds, his notion of schema refreshment is the extension of the Russian formalists' notions of estrangement and de-familiarization to include the extralinguistic knowledge²³.

Cook's notions of schema refreshment and schema reinforcement help to understand better the epistemological status of schema theory in literary studies. Image schema can be regarded as one of the possible kinds of schema reinforcement. Metaphorization in image schema does affect the way in which target domain (tenor) is viewed, structured, experienced, but it does not change the conventional schema represented by the target domain. Metaphorization in image schema either brings into the fore the pre-existing similarities between tenor and vehicle – *The fog comes / on little cat feet* (Carl Sandburg), or enriches the tenor by adding to it new properties without destroying or disrupting the conventional background assumptions in the schemata – *Death is an Elephant, / Torch-eyed and horrible...* (V. Lindsay). In the first sentence the metaphor conveys the 'unexpectedness' of the approaching fog, in the second sentence 'death' is endowed with features characteristic of an 'elephant' ('heavy, with ivory tusks and long trunk') and 'torch' ('flaming light') that actually do not contradict the feelings and emotions associated with death – something unpleasantly heavy, causing pain and torture. The conventionality of metaphorization in image schema is especially conspicuous in *The Road Not Taken* by Robert Frost in which even the first two lines display their clear anchorage to Lakoff and Johnson's metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY. The limitations and immutability of human choices in the poem are due to 'journeys' that unfold in time, which in our civilization is considered as irreversible. This type of metaphorization, leading only to schema reinforcement, is usually denoted by the terms 'mind style' or 'world view'²⁴.

At the same time reconceptualization based on metaphorization may lead to the disruption of conventional schemas, i. e. may be of the 'schema refreshment' type. For instance, in *A Supermarket In California*, which is part of the poem *Howl* by A. Ginsburg, the metaphor LIFE IS SHOPPING disrupts the conventional schema LIFE IS A JOURNEY since the metaphor establishes a novel connection between the target domain (tenor) and the source domain (vehicle). In this sense the two types of metaphorical connection representing different types of reconceptualization are akin to the distinction between Ortony's 'predicate promotion' metaphors, when information extractable from metaphors is old, and 'predicate introduction' metaphors, when metaphors introduce unconventional information²⁵. The difference between the approaches to metaphor by Cook and Ortony is that Ortony treats the distinction between the two types of metaphor as an opposition, while Cook characterizes it as a matter of degree. In my opinion, the principle difference between the two types of reconceptualization is the following. In reconceptualization represented by world views or mind styles the metaphorical connection is of the type *tenor as if, like vehicle, but not the vehicle itself*, since the features transferred from the vehicle to the tenor do not turn the

²³ COOK, nuoroda 20, p. 182 – 220.

²⁴ FOWLER, R. *Linguistics and the novel*. London, 1977, p. 76, 103; LEECH, G. N.: SHORT, M. H. *Style in fiction*. London; New York, 1995, p. 187.

²⁵ ORTONY, A. The role of similarity in similes and metaphors. In *Metaphor and thought*. Cambridge, 1979, p. 199 – 200.

latter into the former: in 'man is a wolf' man is like a wolf, but not the wolf itself. Reconceptualization based on metaphors that disrupt conventional schemas is of the type *tenor not only seems like vehicle, but is the vehicle itself*: the life as portrayed in *A Supermarket in California* not only resembles the shopping activity, but is real shopping. To express it otherwise, in case of world views the mapping of features from vehicle onto tenor do not turn the latter into a new ontological entity, while in the second case such features create new ontological entities or construct new worlds. In the first case reconceptualization is grounded on similarities, either pre-existing or created, in the second case reconceptualization is based on dissimilarities. The aim of worldviews is to cognize the 'actual' world better, while the construction of new worlds is aimed at changing the 'actual' world or at presaging new worlds.

The notions of schema refreshment and schema reinforcement are also helpful to the understanding of cognitive processes in fictions when the connection between different schemata is not founded on metaphorization. Fictional worlds are only partially described in literary texts, since complete descriptions of events, characters, etc. are impossible and unnecessary. Descriptions are always suggestive for writers and poets rely on the readers' prior knowledge of the actual. In this sense fictional worlds are 'parasitical' (U. Eco) and 'incomplete' (Dolezel); they do not assign truth – values to all conceivable propositions and the logical deficiency, according to Dolezel, creates the 'aesthetic efficiency'. Owing to these reasons, V. Lindsay does not supply the reader with additional information in *Abraham Lincoln Walks At Midnight* that Abraham Lincoln is a man who has two arms and two legs and who was President of the USA in 1861 – 65, neither Lawrence Ferlinghetti explains in his poem *A Coney Island of the Mind* who is Goya: *In Goya's greatest scenes we seem to see the people of the world*. Such descriptions are based on 'schema reinforcement' and are suggestive in different ways: they may be implicative, additive, individualizing and so on. The 'schema refreshment' principle is at work, for example, in the first stanza of Emily Dickinson's *Because I Could Not Stop For Death*:

Because I could not stop for Death –
He kindly stopped for me –
The Carriage held but just Ourselves –
And immortality.

'Death' in the poem is human and is a courteous gentleman. In fact, the mystery of death, along with the mystery of God, is the central subject in Dickinson's work: cf. *I heard a Fly buzz – when I died* –

To conclude, the contemporary notion of schema, which is the product of interdisciplinary and intercultural cross-fertilization, can be successfully applied to literary studies, especially while dealing with the epistemological and ontological entities of fictional worlds constructed by literary texts.

Michailas Vinogradovas

Vilniaus universitetas

Muitinės 8, 3000 Kaunas, Lietuva

Tel.: (370 – 7) 422344

Santrauka

Straipsnyje apibrėžiamos „image schema“ ir „schema theory“ sąvokos, atskleidžiama jų samprata, ryšiai bei tarpusavio sąveika. Parodoma svarbi šių sąvokų reikšmė, nustatant meninio pasaulio ontologines / epistemologines savybes grožinės literatūros tekstuose.

„Schemas theory“ šiuolaikinėje kognityvinėje psichologijoje (R. P. Abelson, D. E. Rumelhart, R. C. Schank) ir dirbtinio intelekto teorijoje (M. Minsky, C. J. Fillmore, T. Winograd) aiškina žmogaus pasaulio pažinimo organizavimą. Kognityvinių semantikų išplėtotą „Image schema“ kategoriją iš esmės yra kaip metaforizuotas pažinimo įrankis, kai kognityvinio žymeklio savybės yra nukreiptos į žyminį. Tuo būdu atskleidžiama kompleksinė paprastesnių teiginių vienvė. Santykis tarp „schema theory“ ir „image schema“ yra panašus į hiponimiją. Pirmoji yra superordinarinė, antroji yra hiponimas, kadangi „image schema“ yra tik viena iš galimų Schank'o tematinės organizacijos komponentų. Be to, skirtingas vienaskaitinių formų „schema theory“ ir „image schema“ bei daugiskaitinių formų „schemata“ ir „schemas“ vartojimas kartu atskleidžia ir kitą šių sąvokų sampratos traktavimą. G. Cook'o pateiktas „schema refreshment“ (atnaujinimas), keičiant patį diskursą, yra laikomas vienu svarbiausių literatūros bruožų. „Schema refreshment“ yra pagrįstas metaforizacija, t. y. pateikiamas santykis tarp prieštaringų dalykų: „schemata“ literatūros tekstuose ir diskurso pakeitimų. Minėtasis santykis veda prie realaus pasaulio rekonceptualizacijos. Cook'o sąvoka „schema reinforcement“ geriau padeda suprasti literatūros tekstų meninio pasaulio neužbaigtumą. Į „Schema reinforcement“ gali būti įtraukta ir metaforizacija, tačiau pastaroji paprastai ji yra „image schema“ tipas. „Schema theory“ metodas dar parodo, kad literatūriniuose tekstuose naujų pasaulių konstravimas yra grindžiamas ne skirtingų „schema theory“ panašumais, bet vienos „schemata“ pakeitimu kita. Šiuolaikinės „schema“ samprata yra ne tik įvairių akademinių tarpdisciplinų produktas, bet ir kaip tarpkultūrinis požymis, tikslingai taikomas literatūros studijose, ypač analizuojant įvairius epistemologinius ir ontologinius meninio pasaulio bruožus literatūriniuose tekstuose.

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: asociatyvinė / Gešalto psichologija, sociokultūrinės pagrindinės žinios, pažinimas, fiktyvus / meninis/ naujasis pasaulis, vaizdingumo schema (atspindžio), žinių struktūra, ligvistinė deviacija / modeliavimas, literatūriškumas, literatūrinis tekstas, metafora, metaforizacija, rekonceptualizacija, scena, schema, (atstatymo / papildymo / teorija), pirminė / kryptinė sritis, pasaulėžiūra.