

ՀԱՄԱՇԽԱՐՀԱՅԻՆ ԳՐԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՊԱՏՄՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ԵՎ ՏԵՍՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

Mane` Sarinyan

Docdor in Philology, Associate Professor

Russian-Armenian University, RA NAS Institute of Literature after M. Abeghyan

ORCID ID: 0009-0004-2034-1942

manesarinyan@gmail.com

DOI: 10.54503/1829-0116-2024.1-154

STRUCTURALISM: HEMINGWAY'S NOVEL - MEMOIR "A MOVEABLE FEAST" IN THE LIGHT OF STRUCTURALIST AND MYTH CRITICISM

Keywords: structuralism, structure, system, sign, archetype, quest myth, Hemingway, "A Moveable Feast".

The article explores methodological issues in literary criticism that have their origins in structural linguistics, a theoretical framework established by Ferdinand de Saussure in the early twentieth century. It examines the utilization of the principles of structuralism in literary criticism for the study of literature and literary works. The subject matter of the article is the application of structuralist and myth-critical methodologies in analyzing Hemingway's novel "A Moveable Feast". The aim of the article is to examine the underlying structures and archetypes in the novel, shedding light on its symbolic and universal aspects. The analysis explores elements such as the title, structure, genre, and archetypal patterns within the narrative, revealing the novel's consistency with the rite-of-passage model and quest myth framework. The novelty of the article consists in investigating Hemingway's novel from structuralist and myth-critical perspectives.

Մանե Սարինյան

Բանասիրական գիտությունների թեկնածու, դոցենտ

Հայ-Ռուսական համալսարան, ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Մ. Աբեղյանի անվան

գրականության ինստիտուտ

ORCID ID: 0009-0004-2034-1942

manesarinyan@gmail.com

ՍՏՐՈՒԿՏՈՒՐԱԼԻԶՄ. ՀԵՄԻՆԳՈՒԵՅԻ «ՏՈՆ, ՈՐ ՄԻՇՏ ՔԵՉ ՀԵՏ Է» ԻՆՔՆԱԿԵՆՍԱԳՐԱԿԱՆ ՎԵՊԸ ԿԱՌՈՒՑՎԱԾՔԱՅԻՆ ԵՎ ՄԻՖԱՔՆՆԱԴԱՏԱԿԱՆ ՄԵԿՆՈՒԹՅԱՄԲ

Բանալի բառեր – ստրուկտուրալիզմ, կառուցվածք, համակարգ, նշան, արքետիպ, որոնման միջ, Հեմինգուեյ, «Տոն, որ միշտ քեզ հետ է»:

Հոդվածում անդրադարձ է կատարվում ստրուկտուրալիզմի և ծիսամիջոցական քննադատության հարցերին, որոնք որպես մեթոդաբանական հիմք էին ընդունում քսաներորդ դարասկզբին Ֆերդինանդ դը Սոսյուրի կողմից մշակված կառուցվածքային լեզվաբանության սկզբունքներն ու դրույթները: Ստրուկտուրալիզմը էապես փոխեց գրականագիտության գիտականացման հիմունքը: Գրական երկից անջատելով սոցիալ-պատմական, փիլիսոփայական շերտերը՝ նոր քննադատները գեղարվեստական երկի ուսումնասիրության մեթոդաբանական հիմք ընդունեցին կառուցվածքային մեթոդը՝ հատկապես առանձնացնելով պոետիկայի հարցերը և առաջնությունը տալով գեղարվեստական երկում որոշակի մոդելների, սիմվոլների և արքետիպների գործառնությունը: Հոդվածում Հեմինգուեյի «Տոն, որ միշտ քեզ հետ է» վեպը դիտարկված է արքետիպային

ձևային՝ որոնման միջի շրջանակներում: Վերլուծությունը քննում է կառուցվածքային տարրերը՝ վերնագիրը, ժանրային առանձնահատկությունը, արքեսիպային մոդելները: Հոդվածի նորույթը Հեմինգուեյի վեպի ստրուկտուրալիստական և միջաքննադատական քննությունն է:

Манэ Саринян

Кандидат филологических наук, доцент

*Российско-Армянский университет, Институт литературы
им. М. Абеяна НАН РА*

ORCID ID: 0009-0004-2034-1942

manesarinyan@gmail.com

СТРУКТУРАЛИЗМ: АВТОБИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ РОМАН ХЕМИНГУЭЯ “ПРАЗДНИК, КОТОРЫЙ ВСЕГДА С ТОБОЙ” В СТРУКТУРАЛИСТСКОЙ И МИФОКРИТИЧЕСКОЙ ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИИ

Ключевые слова: структурализм, структура, система, знак, архетип, квест-миф, Хемингуэй, “Праздник, который всегда с тобой”.

В данной статье рассматриваются методологические проблемы литературной критики, которые уходят корнями в структурную лингвистику - теоретическую основу, созданную Фердинандом де Соссюром в начале XX века. Она рассматривает, как принципы структурализма, заимствованные из лингвистики, были применены к изучению литературы. Предметом статьи является использование структуралистских и мифологических методологий при анализе произведения Хемингуэя “Праздник, который всегда с тобой”. Целью данной статьи является изучение основных структур и архетипов в романе, раскрывая его символические и универсальные аспекты. Анализ исследует такие элементы, как заглавие, структура, жанр и архетипические модели в повествовании, выявляя соответствие романа архетипу мифа-квеста. Новизна статьи заключается в исследовании романа Хемингуэя с позиций структурализма и мифокритики.

Introduction

The article explores methodological issues in literary criticism rooted in structural linguistics, a theoretical framework established by Ferdinand de Saussure in the early twentieth century. It highlights the impact of structural linguistics on literary criticism, and its influence on the analysis of literary works. Saussure laid the foundations of structuralism as a methodology, introducing the theory of the systemic nature of language, conceptualizing it as a system of signs with hierarchical units in syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations (Mkhitarian, Chubaryan, 2008, p.18). Signs acquire meaning within a system through linear and vertical relationships. As expressed by Barthes (Barthes, Duisit a,1975, p. 248), “No unit pertaining to a certain level can be endowed with meaning unless it can be integrated into a superior level: a phoneme, although perfectly describable, means nothing by itself; it partakes in meaning only if integrated into a word; and the word itself must in turn be integrated into the sentence”.

The basic concepts in structural linguistics are those of *Langue* and *Parole*, the *Signified* and the *Signifier*. *Langue* represents the abstract form of language, whereas *Parole* is the individual manifestation of speech. Saussure’s focus was on the abstract forms of language rather than the study of individual speech (Saussure a, 2016, pp. 9 -15).

Saussure proposed that the linguistic sign comprises two components: the Signifier, which refers to the spoken or written word, and the Signified, representing the corresponding concept. The correlation between the Signifier and the Signified is not based on any inherent connection; instead, it is a product of convention within a particular linguistic community (Saussure b, 2016, pp. 114-117). Saussure's concepts of the structural nature of language and the distinction between *Langue* and *Parole*, as well as his ideas about the arbitrary nature of the linguistic sign had significant implications for a structuralist approach to literature where meaning is seen as a product of internal relationships and structures within a text rather than a direct reflection of external reality.

The tenets of structural linguistics as a guiding methodology found applications in anthropology, sociology, psychology, literary theory and criticism. The concepts of sign, system, and structure, and the idea of binary oppositions became the basic principles of analysis. According to Collins Dictionary, "Structuralism is a method of interpreting and analyzing such things as language, literature, and society, which focuses on contrasting ideas or elements of structure and attempts to show how they relate to the whole structure". According to Merriam-Webster Dictionary, structuralism is "a method of analysis (as of a literary text or a political system) that is related to cultural anthropology and that focuses on recurring patterns of thought and behavior".

Structuralism is notably manifested in anthropology, particularly through the works of Claude Levi-Strauss. He applied structural linguistic methods to explain the origin and ontology of myth, elucidating the mechanism of mythological thinking that resolves the opposition between death and life through milder forms of oppositions, employing mediators such as dark/light, high/low, and others. Introducing the term "mytheme" as the smallest myth narrative unit, akin to the morpheme in linguistics, Levi-Strauss emphasized a correspondence not between mytheme and word but between mytheme and phoneme. He wrote, "If one wants to establish a parallel between structural linguistics and the structural analysis of myths, the correspondence is established not between mytheme and word but between mytheme and phoneme" (English Wikipedia – The Free Encyclopedia_babylon.com (9.01.2024). "Nowadays, in his analysis of the structure of myth, Levi-Strauss has already specified that constitutive units of mythical discourse (mythemes) become significant only because they appear in clusters which in turn combine themselves" (Barthes, Duisit b, 1975, p. 242).

Structuralism in Literary Criticism

Structuralism in literary criticism is closely tied to structural linguistics, sharing similarities in origin, terminology, and methodology. Literary critics borrowed its main concepts - those of sign, structure and system, and developed their own methods of analysis. The structural categories became the methodological and philosophical foundations of structural linguistics, anthropology, literary theory and criticism. Works of fiction and poetry started to be studied and interpreted from a different perspective. "The poetics of structuralism addresses a key aspect of literary theory, focusing on the synthesis of all textual elements into a unified artistic system" (Sarinyan a, 2018, p. 29). Now the task of a literary critic was to explore and expose universal models, symbols, archetypes, primary patterns

to decode the narrative and view the literary work within a system of a larger entity, in relation with myths. As a consequence, socially and historically relevant factors as well as the psychological portraits of characters were deemed irrelevant.

As such, structuralism rejects historicism and the culture-historical critical methodology, renouncing the philosophical aspect of a literary work. "In a broad sense, structuralism reshapes two theoretically grounded categories. Firstly, it establishes the primacy of subtext over text, emphasizing the detachment of a literary work from philosophy, history, sociology, and other layers of content. Secondly, it advocates for the separation of form from content, portraying the form as an allegorical expression of an idea" (Sarinyan, 2018, p. 52).

"The removal of the Author is not merely an historical fact or an act of writing; it utterly transforms the modern text..." "To give a text an Author is to impose a limit on the text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing", posited Roland Barthes (Barthes, 1977, pp. 145,147). In his statement on "the removal of the Author", Barthes argued traditional notions of literary judgement and the role of the author in shaping the meaning of a text: assigning an author to a text imposes limitations by ascribing a fixed meaning, detaching the text from the author liberates it from predetermined constraints, allowing for a more open-ended interpretation.

However, it is essential to note that Barthes' views have been subject to debate and consideration. While some appreciate the liberation of meaning that comes with removing the author, others argue that acknowledging authorial intent can provide valuable context and insight into the text. Overall, Barthes' assertion seeks to reconsider the traditional relationship between authors and their works proposing a diverse approach to literary interpretation.

The English literary theorist and critic Terry Eagleton offered a critical perspective on structuralism, pointing out what he saw as its limitations. He argued that the quest for a purely objective reading of literary works, as advocated by structuralist literary critics, faces significant challenges. Eagleton claimed that, even when conducted with the highest level of objectivity and rigorous methodology, it is virtually impossible to completely eliminate subjective judgment from an analysis: "But the search for a purely objective reading of literary works clearly poses grievous problems. It seems impossible to eradicate some element of interpretation, and so of subjectivity from even the most rigorously objective analysis" (Eagleton, 1983, p. 106).

"... Structuralism is explicitly anti-individual and to a certain extent, anti-artist. It is not interested in individuality or artistic creativity in and of itself, nor as a unique manifestation of an author's personality. It is only interested in the underlying and shared structures of consciousness found in the work of art or literature. It is a unifying approach. But as it unifies, it also obliterates. This idea is found in a famous essay by Roland Barthes "The Death of the Author" (Structuralism Literary Theory Examples, /https://www.studysmarter.co.uk/ (9.01.2024).

The statement might appear somewhat rigid, implying that structuralism, as a literary theory, is explicitly against emphasizing the role of the individual artist and their distinctive creative expression. One could argue that its focus lies in revealing the shared structures and patterns that underpin works of art or literature, aiming

for an in-depth comprehension of the commonalities and universal aspects of artistic creation.

In the 1920s and 1930s, New Critics declared a crisis in literary criticism and asserted the need for applying scientific methods to the study of literary works. In his article on literary methods, Sergey Sarinyan outlined the key features of New Criticism. "Advocates of this method acknowledge that a literary work encompasses multiple layers of content, including social, psychological, philosophical, moral, and life-mode aspects. However, they assert that these layers fall outside the purview of literary examination and are better suited for exploration by other scientific disciplines. The objective of literary criticism within the framework of New Criticism is to scrutinize the internal structural system of a work.... New Criticism perceives the literary work as an autonomous entity devoid of any connection to the author.... The essence of a literary work is not discerned in the author's or characters' judgments but is rather concealed within individual symbol-words that operate on a subconscious level" (Sarinyan b, 2018, pp. 29-30).

In his work "The Anatomy of Criticism", the Canadian literary critic Northrop Frye established structural principles for narrative analysis, emphasizing modes, genres, symbols, and archetypes. In his critical essay "The Archetypes of Literature", Frye associated literary genres with the archetypes of romance and rhapsodic poetry, comedy and idyll, tragedy and elegy, and satire all of which he observed within the seasonal cycle of the year and the phases of human life (Frye a, 1966, p. 94). Utilizing the terminology of structural linguistics and natural sciences, Frye laid down the scope and methods of critical analysis. Refusing "commentary" and "value-judgements", as well as the "subjective-emotional and objective-descriptive" methods, he posited that there should be some unifying principle for the study of literature based on the structural analysis of a literary work. He argued that in the works of writers there are too many recurring images and patterns which could be accounted for only underlying basic structures. Archetypes are those basic structures about which Frye wrote, "An archetype should be not only a unifying category of criticism, but itself a part of a total form... the search for archetype is a kind of literary anthropology, concerned with the way that literature is informed by pre-literary categories such as ritual, myth and folklore" (Frye b, 1966, p. 91).

Thus, the "systematic study" of literature should be conducted with the perspective of viewing a literary work as part of a larger and deeper construct. By employing inductive reasoning, Frye moved from the specific to the general, from the surface structure to the deep structure, revealing underlying archetypal patterns and myths; then, through deductive reasoning, he formulated their corresponding genre forms. From this standpoint, he interpreted Shakespeare's "Hamlet" as a nature-myth.

While structuralism may not explicitly prioritize historical and cultural contexts, modern literary criticism often incorporates both structuralist and contextual methodologies. The combination of these two approaches allows for a more comprehensive understanding of a work acknowledging the importance of both universal structures and historical or cultural elements.

Hemingway's "A Moveable Feast" in the Light of Structuralist and Myth Criticism

In my analysis of Hemingway's "A Moveable Feast", I have employed structural and myth-critical methodologies aiming at examining the underlying patterns and structures, revealing the novel's consistency with the rite-of-passage model and quest myth framework. The terminology and principles of the analysis fit in the frame of structural linguistics. Structuralist analysis typically involves examining elements of a text, such as the title, structure, genre, and archetypal patterns.

Ernest Hemingway started writing the novel in 1957, which was published posthumously in 1964. In 1956 when he was in Paris, he received the trunks that had been stored in the Ritz Hotel since 1928. In them, he found the notebooks describing events from his life spent in Paris during the 1920s. The American art and literary critic, and biographer Jeffrey Meyers documented that upon Hemingway's arrival in Cuba in early 1957, he embarked on writing his memoir "A Moveable Feast" (Meyers, 1985, p. 533).

The title of the novel was taken from Hemingway's message to his friend and biographer A.E. Hotchner, which appeared as an epigraph to the work published after the writer's death: "If you are lucky enough to have lived in Paris as a young man, then wherever you go for the rest of your life, it stays with you, for Paris is a moveable feast" (Hemingway a, 1965).

The title "A Moveable Feast" carries a metaphorical connotation beyond its literal interpretation. It hints at never ending continuum, embracing elements of ritual reiteration, nostalgic evocation of Paris, feelings and images blended with the emotional and spiritual experiences of Hemingway as a young writer, as well as the feast of the spirit, and the spiritualization of the time and space. During that period, Hemingway met with F. Scott Fitzgerald, Gertrude Stein, Ezra Pound, James Joyce, Pablo Picasso, and other renowned people. The moveable feast symbolizes the spirited nature of the social and artistic interactions Hemingway experienced during that time. At its core, the lexeme *moveable* signifies flexibility. In this context, however, flexibility transforms into permanence, with the concept itself taking on an opposite meaning in that it accompanied the writer throughout his life.

As for its religious meaning, the term *moveable feast* is particularly interpreted in the context of Christianity. In the Christian liturgical calendar, it refers to a religious holiday or feast day that does not have a fixed date but is instead determined based on the date of Easter, which itself varies each year. Easter is the most important movable feast in Christianity, and many other feasts are calculated in relation to it.

By genre, the book is a memoir wherein Hemingway recounts the events from his life in Paris as an expatriate writer in the early 1920s. "A Moveable Feast" is more than a mere recollection of the past; it is a literary testament to the writer's journey of growth, the shaping of his artistic identity, and the enduring influence of the Parisian backdrop on his life and work. Narrated in the first person, the book presents events through a series of loosely connected and episodic sketches, bringing together characters and events. Each chapter constitutes a self-contained story or snapshot creating the overall picture of Paris during that period. Bars, cafes

and wine render ritualistic character to the story. In the preface to the book, Hemingway gives his perspective on the nature of the work, "If the reader prefers, this book may be regarded as fiction. But there is always the chance that such a book of fiction may throw some light on what has been written as fact" (Hemingway b, 1965, ix). The passage testifies to Hemingway's intention to blur the boundaries between fiction and reality.

As mentioned above, Northrop Frye correlated literary genres with the seasonal cycle of the year and the organic cycle of human life. In this analysis, Frye's table of phases has been applied to the genre and archetypal features of "A Moveable Feast". As such, the archetypes of romance and rhapsodic poetry, which are associated with the dawn, spring, and birth phase, have been elicited. The novel symbolically portrays the birth of an emerging writer, his romantic quest, and the search for new forms and poetics.

Most myths have their origins in rituals. Among the central myths is the quest myth, which itself is rooted in the rites of passage or initiation. In various cultures, the quest myth often narrates a hero's journey or transformative experience, symbolizing the trials and personal growth encountered during the pursuit of a certain goal. This archetype, deeply intertwined with the human experience, reflects the universal themes of self-discovery, resilience, and the cyclical nature of personal development. A literary critic is bound "to show how all literary genres are derived from the quest-myth..." So "...the central myth of literature, in its narrative aspect", is the quest-myth (Frye c, 1966, pp. 94, 95). Frye's statement underscores his perspective on the essential role of the quest myth in literature. As such, a literary critic's obligation is to demonstrate the interconnectedness of all literary genres by tracing their origins back to the quest myth. In Frye's framework, the quest myth holds a central position in literature, and, regardless of genre or form, the basic narrative structures often revolve around a quest, representing a journey, search, and experience.

In essence, "A Moveable Feast" embodies the archetype of a quest myth, depicting the "journey" of a man of letters into the realm of literature, serving as Hemingway's own "monomyth".

The term "monomyth" often relates to the American mythologist Joseph Campbell's concept of the hero's journey, emphasizing common elements and stages shared by various heroic narratives. In his work "The Hero with a Thousand Faces", he developed the schema of the journey of the archetypal hero, otherwise called "monomyth". He assumed that in the basis of all myths underlies a central pattern which is referred to as "the hero's journey". In myth narratives, the initiation or quest begins as the hero leaves his home, overcomes obstacles and difficulties, defeats the dark powers, and returns home with gifts and rewards, having undergone a rite of passage or initiation. "The standard path of the mythological adventure of the hero is a magnification of the formula represented in the rites of passage: separation - initiation - return: which might be named the nuclear unit of the monomyth. A hero ventures forth from the world of common day into a region of supernatural wonder: fabulous forces are there encountered and a decisive victory is won: the hero comes back from this mysterious adventure with the power to bestow boons on his fellow man" (Campbell, 2004, p. 28). The hero's

journey typically represents a metaphorical and symbolic journey of personal growth, transformation and discovery.

Hemingway embarks on an adventure as a writer, encountering emotional and psychological challenges in his professional quest or in his “journey”. On the archetypal level, the narrative can be seen as a quest myth. It portrays the rise of a writer, his search for style, for “the one and only correct word”, for “one true sentence”, quest for simplicity influenced by Cézanne’s paintings to achieve dimension and depth in his stories through the use of simple, truthful sentences, and simple structures. It is the writer’s odyssey: an everlasting QUEST for WORD, a long journey into the realm of words. The writer’s philosophy, inner potential, vigor, experience, potent force, taste, and style are encapsulated in a Word; a feat that demands courage, skill and strength. It is rightly said, “In the beginning was the WORD...” (Genesis 1:1-3, 26 and Gospel of John 1:1-3).

Here are some of Hemingway’s writing anxieties, and his thoughts on writing technique from “A Moveable Feast”: “But sometimes when I was starting a new story and I could not get it going, I would sit in front of the fire and squeeze the peel of the little oranges into the edge of the flame and watch the sputter of blue that they made. I would stand and look out over the roofs of Paris and think, “Do not worry. You have always written before and you will write now. All you have to do is write one true sentence. Write the truest sentence that you know”. So finally, I would write one true sentence, and then go on from there. It was easy then because there was always one true sentence that I knew or had seen or had heard someone say. If I started to write elaborately, or like someone introducing or presenting something, I found that I could cut that scrollwork or ornament out and throw it away and start with the first true simple declarative sentence I had written” (Hemingway c, 1965, p. 12). The lines reflect Hemingway’s struggle with starting new stories, putting an emphasis on the importance of beginning with a single true sentence, and underscoring the value he placed on authenticity and the simplicity of expression in his craft.

As mentioned above, in his quest, Hemingway met with outstanding artists and writers, all of whom, in one way or another, were connected to Hemingway’s life and career as a writer. They played a pivotal role in shaping the philosophy and spiritual quest of the Lost Generation, a term coined by Gertrude Stein to describe the writers of the postwar era. “All of you young people who served in the war. You are a lost generation..... You have no respect for anything. You drink yourselves to death”, she said to Hemingway (Hemingway d, 1965, p. 29).

In the archetypal pattern of hero’s journey there are always guides who escort him in his quest towards a goal. In the novel, Gertrude Stein can be seen as an archetypal mentor. The chapter where Stein first appears is entitled “Miss Stein Instructs”. Stein was an American expatriate writer who hosted a Studio in Paris visited by outstanding writers and artists of the time. She acquainted Hemingway with the writers of the Lost Generation, and they talked about art, literature, narrative technique, rhythm, and the vocation of a writer.

Ezra Pound, another prominent figure in American literature and criticism and known for his loyalty, kindness and good graces, archetypally prefigures as a saint and mentor. Hemingway confessed, “... I always thought of him as a sort of

saint” (Hemingway e, 1965, p. 108). It was Ezra Pound who advised him to use “the one and only correct word”, who taught him “to distrust adjectives”.

In the epigraph to the chapters dedicated to Scott Fitzgerald, Hemingway wrote about Fitzgerald’s innate talent, allegorically comparing it with the natural patterns on a butterfly’s wings which were marred the way he dissipated and exhausted his graces and inherent gift in drinking, partying, and the problems caused by his wife’s mental disorder. Much of his inner disturbance and restlessness stemmed from despair. In this sense, Fitzgerald’s personality is paralleled to the archetype of a scapegoat, shouldering the blame for the sins of others and his own faults alike. Features of a wounded child archetype can also be traced in his character. In retrospect, he is portrayed as loyal, candid, “charming and endearing”. In contrast to Fitzgerald’s romantic sensibility, another character type emerges - a man of poise, fortitude and “intellectual control”. Within the dichotomy of these two contrastive characters, the structure of binary opposition is evident, reflecting one of the underlying structuralist principles.

Later Fitzgerald would write, “I talk with the authority of failure, Ernest with the authority of success. We could never sit across the same table again” (Cooperman, 1965, p. 52).

Literary figures pass one by one, and this carnival of masks creates the tale of the Lost Generation. The central theme of the narrative revolves around the virtues of loyalty, dedication, and fortitude.

The resolution of the novel is in accord with the quest myth framework: Hemingway’s completion of his first outstanding novel “The Sun Also Rises” marks a significant accomplishment in his literary journey, earning positive reviews and acclaim from literary critics upon publication, and this achievement aligns with the quest storyline.

In the artistic milieu of the time, Paris acquires a cultural value. The novel comprises twenty sections that depict the writer’s life in Paris, his literary pursuits, and his observations of life, people, and places, “the early days when.....very poor and very happy” he followed his calling, his “bliss”, a phrase often repeated by Joseph Campbell, who compressed his life philosophy in the phrase “Follow your bliss”. “To have come on all this new world of writing.....where there was a way of living well and working, no matter how poor you were, was like having a great treasure given to you” (Hemingway f, 1965, p. 132). Exactly, in his early days as a writer, marked by both poverty and contentment, Hemingway passionately pursued his calling, discovering a new world of writing comparable to receiving a great treasure.

Events unfold in a segmental sequence making up a paradigm of human relations. The unity of time and space constitutes an extended metaphor acquiring a cognitive implication. This initiates the reader into the mores and ethics of the period, laying down the values professed by the aesthetes of the time. All this creates the legendary picture of the city whose artistic ambience attracts painters and literary people throughout, rendering an archetypal significance to Paris.

Conclusion

The article introduces a novel perspective by employing structuralist and myth-critical methodologies to analyze Hemingway’s work “A Moveable Feast”.

The innovation lies at the intersection of structural linguistics with literary criticism, particularly in how structuralist principles are used to decode and interpret the novel. The significance of these methodologies lies in exploring patterns, symbols, and archetypes within the narrative, as well as in revealing the archetypal roles played by the characters in the novel. Hemingway's work follows the quest myth framework, depicting the author's journey as a young writer through a rite-of-passage narrative.

References

1. **Barthes R., Duisit L.**, An Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative // New Literary History, Vol. 6, No. 2, On Narrative and Narratives. (Winter, 1975), The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 237-272.
2. **Barthes R.**, The Death of the Author // Image, Music, Text, Essays, selected and translated by Stephen Heath, Hill and Wang / New York, 1977, pp. 142-148.
3. **Campbell J.**, The Hero with a Thousand Faces, Bollingen Series 17-th, Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford, 2004, 464 p.
4. Collins Dictionary, Structuralism, <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english> (13.01.2024).
5. **Cooperman S.**, F. Scott Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby, A Critical Commentary // Monarch Notes, Department of English, Simon Fraser University, Monarch Press, 1965, 59 p.
6. **Eagleton T.**, Literary Theory, Second Edition, St. Catherine's College, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 1983, 234 p.
7. **Frye F.**, The Archetypes of Literature // Myth and Literature: Contemporary Theory and Practice, edited by John Vickery, First Edition, University of Nebraska Press, January 1, 1966, pp. 87-97.
8. Genesis 1:1-3, 26 and Gospel of John 1:1-3.
9. **Hemingway E.**, A Moveable Feast, New York, Bantam Books, 1965, 209 p.
10. **Levi-Strauss**, English Wikipedia – The Free Encyclopedia_ babylon.com (10.01.2024).
11. Merriam - Webster Dictionary, Structuralism, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary> (13.01.2024).
12. **Meyers J.** Biography, London, Macmillan, 1985, 734 p.
13. **Mkhitaryan Y., Chubaryan A.**, Theoretical English Grammar, Yerevan, YSU Press, 2008, 521 p.
14. **Sarinyan S.**, Literary Methods // Two Centuries of Armenian Literature, Vol. 7, Yerevan, "Armar" Publishing House, 2018, pp. 10-39. (Armenian_ Գրականագիտական մեթոդներ // Հայոց գրականության երկու դարը: Grakanagitakan metodner // Hayots' grakanut'yan yerku dary).
15. **Sarinyan S.**, Literary Studies within the System of Humanities // Two Centuries of Armenian Literature, Vol. 7, Yerevan, "Armar" Publishing House, 2018, pp. 40-54. (Armenian_Գրականագիտությունը հումանիտար գիտությունների համակարգում//Հայոց գրականության երկու դարը: Grakanagitut'yuny humanitar gitut'yunneri hamakargum // Hayots' grakanut'yan yerku dary).
16. **Saussure F.**, Course in General Linguistics, translated from French by Wade Baskin, ed. by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, in collaboration with Albert Reidlinger, New York, Philosophical Library, 2016, 240 p.
17. Structuralism Literary Theory Examples /<https://www.studysmarter.co.uk/> (9.01.2024).

Mane` Sarinyan - a PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at Russian-Armenian (Slavonic) University, Researcher at NAS AR Institute of Literature after M. Abeghyan. Her research interests encompass myth criticism, and contemporary mythmaking in literature. She has contributed and contributes to the compilation of volumes for the academic edition of collected works of the Armenian classics Levon Shant and Nikol Aghbalyan. She has curated the bibliography of the

Armenian literary critic Sergey Sarinyan and compiled the seventh volume of S. Sarinyan's "Two Centuries of Armenian Literature". She is the author of one monograph and fourteen scientific articles.

ORCID ID: 0009-0004-2034-1942
manesarinyan@gmail.com

Մանե Սարինյան – Բանասիրական գիտությունների թեկնածու, Հայ-Ռուսական (Սլավոնական) համալսարանի դոցենտ, ԳԱԱ Մ. Աբեղյանի անվան գրականության ինստիտուտի գիտաշխատող: Գիտական հետաքրքրությունների շրջանակը՝ միջաքննադատություն, միջաստեղծումը ժամանակակից գրականության մեջ: Մասնակցել և մասնակցում է հայ դասականների՝ Լևոն Շանթի և Նիկոլ Աղբալյանի երկերի ժողովածուների ակադեմիական հրատարակության հատորների կազմմանը: Կազմել է Սերգեյ Սարինյանի կենսամատենագիտությունը և Սարինյանի «Հայոց գրականության երկու դարը» հոդվածների և ուսումնասիրությունների յոթերորդ հատորը: Հեղինակ է մեկ մենագրության և տասնչորս հոդվածների:

ORCID ID: 0009-0004-2034-1942
manesarinyan@gmail.com

Манэ Саринян – Кандидат филологических наук, доцент Российско-Армянского (Славянского) университета, научный сотрудник Института литературы имени М. Абегамяна НАН АР. Область научных интересов: мифокритика и мифотворчество в современной литературе. Участвовала и участвует в составлении томов академического издания собраний сочинений армянских классиков – Левона Шанта и Никола Агбаляна. Составила библиографию армянского литературоведа Сергея Сариняна и седьмой том “Два века армянской литературы” С. Сариняна. Автор одной монографии и четырнадцати статей.

ORCID ID: 0009-0004-2034-1942
manesarinyan@gmail.com

Ընդունվել է տպագրության 6.03.2024թ.: