

Importing TRIZ into Narratology for LLM-Assisted Story Analysis

Milka Kaplan, Armin Shmilovici, Mark Last

Information Systems Engineering Department

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

P.O.B. 653, Beer-Sheva, Israel

milkak@post.bgu.ac.il, armin@bgu.ac.il, mlast@bgu.ac.il

Abstract

A *ticking clock* accelerates pace but shortens the time required for the hero to complete a test; a *forbidden zone* builds tension, but a *secret revelation* dissipates it. A TRIZ-inspired contradiction matrix (Theory of Inventive Problem Solving) describes contradictions between narrative devices as a method to improve the perceived quality of a narrative (e.g., increase tension while resolving it logically).

In this preliminary work, we implement ten narrative devices and thirteen recurrent conflict pairs from a TRIZ-inspired contradiction matrix. We design a LLM prompt that detects those devices and conflicts in a narrated text and apply it to a genre-pilot corpus of five movie synopses and five literary texts spanning different genres (satire, tragedy, romance, comedy, and mystery). Three LLMs serve as annotators (Claude Opus 4.7, Gemini 3 Flash Preview, DeepSeek (chat)). Our preliminary results show that applying the contradiction matrix reveals structural tensions across genres and that conflict density discriminates structural sophistication.

Introduction

The *TRIZ* (Theory of Inventive Problem Solving) was developed by Altshuller for the purpose of systematically generating inventive solutions to engineering problems (Altshuller 1999). Its central instrument, the *contradiction matrix*, identifies pairs of conflicting engineering parameters (e.g., improving the strength of a part tends to worsen its weight) and recommends inventive principles that have historically resolved each pairwise tension. The matrix is not a theory of invention so much as a condensed map of where invention becomes necessary.

Narrative design, we argue, faces a structurally analogous situation. Writers frequently employ devices that *improve* one dimension of a story while *worsening* another. A ticking clock (McKee 1997) improves narrative pace but compresses the time available for a hero's test (Campbell 1949), which itself improves character transformation at the cost of pace. A Chekhov's gun (a piece of information relevant only at a later stage) improves plot economy but reduces accessibility if the reader forgets the planted detail by the time it fires. A reconciliation scene (Aristotle 1902) improves emotional resolution but can preempt character transformation if it arrives before the ordeal completes.

These are contradictions in the precise TRIZ sense: two techniques, each genuinely useful, must be deployed together, and the way the writer resolves their tension *is* the story. Prior work has noted the intuitive parallel between TRIZ and creative writing (Mohammadi and Forouzanfar 2024), but only Palma and Jager (Palma and Jager 2026) has attempted the systematic step of constructing a TRIZ-style contradiction matrix for narrative - a 24×24 matrix populated from a 40-device list. Their proposal is theoretical: the matrix is presented as a navigational tool for retrieval-augmented story generation but is explicitly noted to be "an initial exploration" that has not yet been empirically tested.

Our contribution is precisely that test. We check the effect of contradicting narrative devices in real narrative work - literature and cinema. We extract a working subset of ten devices and thirteen recurrent conflict pairs from Palma's matrix, design an LLM-grounded protocol for their detection, and apply it to a small but genre-balanced corpus. The goal is not to propose a definitive Palma's classification or to revise it but to explore whether the matrix - as proposed - makes structural tensions LLM-detectable at the corpus scale.

Device Vocabulary

10 narrative devices (Table 1) were selected from a 40-device list (Palma and Jager 2026) because they represent intuitively recognizable narrative techniques, accessible to both human readers and LLM annotators without requiring deep narratological expertise. The selection is deliberately heterogeneous: devices range from plot-structural (*Chekhov's Gun*, *Ticking Clock*) to character-theoretic (*Moral Dilemma*, *Hero's Test*) to information-managerial (*Secret Revelation*, *Historical Witness*) to thematic (Fate vs. Choice, Reconciliation Scene). Each device is operationalized by explicit textual markers: a Ticking Clock requires an explicit deadline plus an irreversible consequence; a Chekhov's Gun requires a conspicuous setup and a later structurally decisive payoff; a Forbidden Zone requires an institutionally established prohibition. The device numbering (3, 9, 12, . . . , 38) follows Palma's list, preserved here so that the matrix in Appendix B is readable against its original. Full definitions with positive/negative examples and edge cases are given in Appendix A.

#	Device	Source
3	Hero's Test	(Campbell 1949)
9	Ticking Clock	(McKee 1997)
12	Impossible Task	(Propp 1968)
13	Chekhov's Gun	(McKee 1997)
23	Forbidden Zone	(Propp 1968)
26	Secret Revelation	(McKee 1997)
28	Historical Witness	(Genette 1980)
33	Moral Dilemma	(Booth 1983)
37	Fate vs. Choice	(Aristotle 1902)
38	Reconciliation Scene	(Aristotle 1902)

Table 1: Ten narrative devices. Numbering follows a larger 40-device list (Appendix A).

The Narrative Contradiction Matrix

Narrative Parameters are measurable qualities of a narrative that can be either strengthened or weakened. In the matrix of contradictions from 24 narrative parameters (Palma and Jager 2026) they form the rows and columns: *Narrative Pace*, *Plot Complexity*, *Causal Clarity*, *Character Depth*, and so on. The parameters are cross-tabbed with each other, where each cell (i, j) lists devices that *improve* parameter i at the cost of parameter j and the pairs of Narrative Devices found in the corresponding cell show how to resolve that conflict. A conflict pair arises when two selected devices co-occur in the same cell, but when deployed together in a narrative they pull against each other, creating a structural tension. The full matrix is reproduced in Appendix B for reference.

Narrative Devices are the concrete techniques applied in order to influence those parameters. For example: Ticking Clock, Unreliable Narrator, Chekhov's Gun, Parallel Action. They are numbered 1–40 and appear inside the cells of the matrix. For example, Plot Complexity improves at the cost of Narrative Pace: a intricate, multi-layered plot naturally slows the story down. The devices Ticking Clock and Hero's Test help resolve this tension by introducing a countdown or putting the hero to a test, the writer can maintain narrative complexity without sacrificing pace.

Similarly, if the goal is to strengthen Surprise (16) without weakening Suspense/Tension (4), the devices Secret Revelation (26) and/or Sudden Reversal (10) offer a way to surprise the reader without dissolving the accumulated tension. This is particularly relevant in thrillers and detective fiction, where a surprise should not release tension but intensify it.

So, by scanning all cells in the matrix 13 conflicting pairs were extracted from it - all pairs of the ten selected devices that co-occur in these cells. Table 2 lists 13 conflicts and the main parameter in a conflict.

A worked cell. Consider Conflict 1 (Ticking Clock vs. Hero's Test). On the Pace/Complexity axis, Ticking Clock appears in the cell (*Pace* ↑, *Complexity* ↓): it improves pace but simplifies the plot. Hero's Test appears in the transposed cell (*Complexity* ↑, *Pace* ↓): it complicates the plot but requires slow development. Both devices are individually productive; deployed together, they are in direct oppo-

#	Device A	Device B	Parameter(s) in tension
1	Ticking Clock	Hero's Test	Plot Complexity↑ / Pace↓
2	Forbidden Zone	Secret Revelation	Plot Complexity↑ / Suspense↓
3	Hero's Test	Moral Dilemma	Plot Complexity↑ / Char. Depth↓ Char. Transform ↓ Intellectual c.
4	Ticking Clock	Impossible Task	Plot Complexity↑ / Char. Agency↓
5	Chekhov's Gun	Ticking Clock	Plot Complexity ↓ Accessibility
6	Hist. Witness	Impossible Task	Suspense ↓ Education
7	Reconciliation	Secret Revelation	Resolution ↓ Clarity Resolution ↓ Surprise
8	Hist. Witness	Moral Dilemma	Char. Depth↑ / Timeline↓ Char. Depth ↓ Hist. c. Char. Depth ↓ Education
9	Fate vs. Choice	Impossible Task	Char. Agency↑ / Causal Clarity↓
10	Fate vs. Choice	Hist. Witness	Char. Agency↑ / Timeline↓ Char. Believability↑ / Timeline↓ Char. Relatability↑ / Timeline↓ Hist. c.↑ / Char. Agency↓
11	Hero's Test	Reconciliation	Char. Relatability↑ / Char. Transform↓ Char. Transform ↓ Emotional c.
12	Fate vs. Choice	Moral Dilemma	Char. Agency ↓ Intellectual c. Char. Believability↑ / Intellectual c.↓ Char. Consistency↑ / Plot Complexity↓ Char. Consistency↑ / Char. Agency↓ Thematic c.↑ / Char. Agency↓
13	Reconciliation	Hist. Witness	Education↑ / Suspense↓

Table 2: Thirteen conflict pairs derived from Palma's matrix, with all parameter axes along which each pair is in tension. Single-arrow notation ($X↑ / Y↓$) marks asymmetric tensions, where one direction was attested in Palma's matrix but the inverse was not. Double-arrow notation ($X↕ Y$) marks bidirectional tensions, where both directions were attested.

sition on the Pace/Complexity axis. For example, in Giovanni's Room (Baldwin 1956), one of the corpus novellas, the narrative effect of maximum urgency against an ordeal that resists compression, the execution clock compresses time while the hero's transformation demands its expansion is precisely what structures the tragedy: Giovanni's execution at dawn collides with David's impossible inner transformation. As captured in the line: "*The hours of this night begin to dwindle . . . as naked and silver as that great knife which Giovanni will be facing very soon.*"

LLM-Assisted Detection Protocol

For each text, we query the annotator LLM with a structured prompt containing four components:

1. For each of the ten devices: a definition, key textual markers, a positive example (a passage where the device is clearly present, with explanation), a negative example (a superficially similar passage where the device is *absent*, with explanation), and a borderline case (a borderline passage with the verdict and reasoning).
2. A 0–4 confidence scale for the LLM's judgement (0: absent; 1: minimally matches; 2: partially agree; 3: mostly correct; 4: explicit), with the requirement that any confidence ≥ 1 be accompanied by a verbatim textual quote.

The confidence scale implicitly guided the model toward the most textually explicit and unambiguous instance, since higher confidence scores require stronger textual grounding.

3. The list of thirteen conflict pairs with the parameter in conflict and a one-sentence effect description.
4. A working demonstration, showing both the device-level annotations and the conflict-level reasoning.

Confidence scores are subsequently binarized under a deliberately conservative rule: scores of 3 or 4 (*mostly correct, explicit*) are coded as detected (1), while scores of 0, 1 or 2 (*absent, minimally matches, partially agree*) are coded as not detected (0). This thresholding suppresses borderline detections, where annotator disagreement is most likely, and forces the analysis to operate on the devices where the LLM was confident enough to commit to. For each conflict where both binarized devices are detected, the LLM returns the parameter visible in this text, two co-located quotes, and a narrative-effect explanation.

To assess the stability of the framework across annotators, we ran the same protocol with three LLMs: Claude Opus 4.7, Gemini 3 Flash Preview, and DeepSeek (chat). The protocol was validated by the first author on five canonical texts spanning genres (*Animal Farm*, *Canterville Ghost*, *Giovanni's Room*, etc.). First author, a doctoral researcher specializing in computational narratology with prior expertise in literary analysis of the corpus works.

A representative device-level output for *Giovanni's Room*:

```
[9] TICKING CLOCK --- Confidence: 4. Evidence: "The hours of this night begin to dwindle . . . as naked and silver as that great knife which Giovanni will be facing very soon." Explanation: The entire novel is framed by the explicit, irreversible deadline of Giovanni's execution at dawn.
```

A representative conflict-level output for the same text:

```
CONFLICT 1 --- Ticking Clock [9] vs. Hero's Test [3]. Parameter: Pace↓ / Complexity↑. Narrative effect: The test of David's capacity to love required slow inner transformation across months in Giovanni's room; the execution clock retroactively reveals that the time was always running out - the test could never be passed at the pace it demanded.
```

The confidence scale allows coarse discrimination of device strength without over-calibrating to subjective judgement; the requirement that the LLM cites two co-located quotes for each conflict forces the annotator to ground the structural claim in the text rather than hallucinating structural effects.

Corpus

We applied the proposed protocol to a small but genre-balanced corpus of ten texts, designed to test the matrix across both narrative scales and genre conventions (Table 3). The corpus is split evenly into two halves. For the first half we used a clean set of synopses from the MPST corpus collected from IMDb, a collection of 14,828 movie synopses with tags (Kar et al. 2018) range from 177 to 1,096 words. Each instantiating one canonical narrative genre: *Beauty and*

the Beast (fairy tale / romance), *Cinderella* (fairy tale / comedy), *The Land Beyond the Sunset* (short tale / minimal-structure baseline), *Antony & Cleopatra* (historical tragedy), and *Julius Caesar* (political tragedy).

The second half consists of five complete novellas (Goodreads 2008) range from 11,498 to 60,662 words, each a critically-recognized representative of its genre: *Animal Farm* (allegory / political satire), *Of Mice and Men* (naturalist tragedy), *The Canterville Ghost* (Victorian comedy of manners), *Giovanni's Room* (modernist moral drama), and *The Hound of the Baskervilles* (detective mystery). The genre-per-text design ensures that any conflict pattern recovered by the matrix can be tested against the genre-theoretic predictions for that text type, rather than against a generic "literary" baseline.

The full text of each novella was included in the prompt as a plain text (.txt) file. This was feasible for all ten texts given the 1M token context window supported by all chosen three models.

The context window for all three models is 1 million tokens. Gemini 3 Flash preview was queried via API with `temperature = 0`. Claude Opus 4.7 does not support the temperature parameter; instead, it was configured with `thinking={"type": "adaptive"}` and `output_config={"effort": "high"}`. DeepSeek (deepseek-chat) was accessed via web interface with default settings. As stated in Anthropic's official documentation, `temperature = 0` never guaranteed identical outputs even in prior models (Anthropic 2026) and full reproducibility cannot be assumed. Given that this is a small pilot study of ten texts developed as a proof of concept, the binarized results include a conservative threshold (where 1 was awarded only for a score of 3 or 4), which provides some natural protection against minor score fluctuations.

Initial Results

The substantial difference in scale between the two text types is consistent with the observed difference in mean conflict density (3.2 for synopses vs. 6.4 for novellas). Within each group, text length also appears to correlate with conflict count: the shortest synopsis (*The Land Beyond the Sunset*, 177 words) yields zero conflicts, while the two longest novellas (*The Hound of the Baskervilles* and *Giovanni's Room*) yield the highest conflict counts (9 and 7 respectively). This suggests that word count may serve as a useful covariate in future large-scale analyses.

Inter-annotator agreement was computed at two levels (see Table 4). At the score level, mean $\kappa = 0.39$; at the quote level, mean $\kappa = 0.52$, Krippendorff's $\alpha = 0.52$. That suggests that LLMs tend to identify the same textual passages as relevant, but differ in their confidence assessments. This implies that the disagreement between annotators is primarily one of degree rather than of substance.

Per-device analysis (Table 5) reveals that devices with explicit textual markers yield higher agreement (e.g. *Moral Dilemma* $\alpha = 0.74$), while *Forbidden Zone* $\alpha = 0.23$ and *Impossible Task* $\alpha = 0.28$ are the most challenging, sug-

References

- Altshuller, G. S. 1999. *The Innovation Algorithm: TRIZ, Systematic Innovation and Technical Creativity*. Technical Innovation Center, Inc.
- Anthropic. 2026. Model migration guide. <https://platform.claude.com/docs/en/about-claude/models/migration-guide>. Accessed: May 2026.
- Aristotle. 1902. *Poetics*. London: Macmillan.
- Baldwin, J. 1956. *Giovanni's Room*. New York: Dial Press. Paperback edition: Laurel, 1988, 178 pp.
- Booth, W. C. 1983. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2nd edition.
- Campbell, J. 1949. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Capellani, A. 1908. La belle et la bête. [Movie]. Pathé Frères, France.
- Doyle, A. C. 1902. *The Hound of the Baskervilles*. London: George Newnes.
- Edison, T. A. 1912. The land beyond the sunset. [Movie]. Edison Manufacturing Company.
- Genette, G. 1980. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Geronimi, C.; Jackson, W.; and Luske, H. 1950. Cinderella. [Movie]. Walt Disney Productions.
- Goodreads. 2008. World's greatest novellas. Goodreads list of highly rated novellas. <https://www.goodreads.com/list/show/1236.World>.
- Kaplan, M.; Shmilovici, A.; and Last, M. 2026. Structural patterns in award-winning novellas. In *Proceedings of the Text2Story'26 Workshop*. 29 March 2026.
- Kar, S.; Maharjan, S.; López-Monroy, A. P.; and Solorio, T. 2018. MPST: A corpus of movie plot synopses with tags. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*. Miyazaki, Japan: European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Mankiewicz, J. L. 1908a. Antony and cleopatra. [Movie]. 20th Century Fox.
- Mankiewicz, J. L. 1908b. Julius caesar. [Movie]. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.
- McKee, R. 1997. *Story: Substance, Structure, Style, and the Principles of Screenwriting*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Mohammadi, A., and Forouzanfar, F. 2024. A TRIZ-based algorithm for systematic story creation. *Creativity Studies*.
- Orwell, G. 1945. *Animal Farm*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Palma, C., and Jager, B. 2026. Rethinking TRIZ for AI-driven narrative generation.
- Palma, C. 2025. *Neurosymbolic Narrative Generation for Cultural Heritage*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Università degli Studi di Bari Aldo Moro.
- Propp, V. 1968. *Morphology of the Folktale*. American Folklore Society Bibliographical and Special Series. Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics, 2nd edition.
- Steinbeck, J. 1937. *Of Mice and Men*. New York: Covici Friede.
- Wilde, O. 1887. The canterville ghost. *The Court and Society Review*.

Appendix A: Narrative Device Definitions

For each device we provide: a definition with key markers, a positive example (device present), a negative example (device absent), and a borderline case with verdict.

[3] Hero's Test

Source: Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (1949).

Definition: The hero faces an ordeal that tests inner qualities—courage, wisdom, or moral worth. The outcome depends on the hero's *character*, not luck or external force.

Key markers: (i) a challenge is explicitly or implicitly issued; (ii) the hero must draw on inner resources; (iii) passing leads to reward, failing to loss; (iv) a donor, judge, or antagonist often administers the test.

Positive: “The witch told Ivan he must guard her herd of mares for three nights without losing a single one. If he succeeded, she would give him the magic horse. If he failed, she would eat him.” — explicit ordeal with moral stakes and reward/punishment structure.

Negative: “Ivan struggled to cross the flooded river in the dark.” — an obstacle, not a test; no one judges Ivan's character; no reward depends on the outcome.

Edge case: “The princess said she would only marry the man who could answer her three riddles.” — PRESENT: functions as a Hero's Test because the outcome reveals the hero's wisdom and determines his fate.

[9] Ticking Clock

Source: McKee, *Story* (1997).

Definition: A deadline imposed on the protagonist that compresses time and forces immediate action. The deadline must carry a consequence: if the protagonist does not act before time runs out, something irreversible happens.

Key markers: (i) explicit or implicit deadline (“before dawn,” “by midnight”); (ii) clear consequence if missed; (iii) urgency accelerates decisions; (iv) often appears mid-story to raise stakes.

Positive: “She had until the last petal fell from the enchanted rose. When the final petal dropped, the curse would become permanent and the Beast would die forever.” — explicit deadline with irreversible consequence.

Negative: “Years passed. Ivan grew old waiting for his chance.” — time passes but there is no deadline, no urgency, no consequence for delay.

Edge case: “The enemy army would reach the village in three days.” — PRESENT: a concrete deadline with catastrophic consequence if not met.

[12] Impossible Task

Source: Propp, *Morphology of the Folktale* (1968) — function M.

Definition: A task assigned to the hero that appears impossible by ordinary means. Structurally paired with function N (Solution), it exposes the false hero and confirms the true hero, usually through magical aid or inner virtue.

Key markers: (i) task is explicitly assigned, impossible by ordinary means; (ii) assigning figure is an authority (tsar,

princess, antagonist); (iii) completion determines life, marriage, or reward; (iv) ordinary characters fail; the true hero succeeds.

Positive: “The tsar announced: whoever could build a flying ship by morning would receive his daughter's hand and half the kingdom. Every prince tried and failed. Ivan received help from the old beggar and arrived at dawn with a ship that sailed the clouds.” — task assigned by authority, impossible by ordinary means, resolved through magical aid.

Negative: “Ivan had to cross the burning desert to reach the castle.” — a dangerous journey, not an assigned impossible task; no authority set it as a condition; no false hero is exposed.

Edge case: “‘Bring me the firebird alive,’ said the tsar, ‘and you shall have your reward. Fail, and you will lose your head.’” — PRESENT: formally assigned, impossible by ordinary means, life-or-death stakes.

[13] Chekhov's Gun

Source: McKee, *Story* (1997).

Definition: Every element introduced must eventually serve a purpose. An object, detail, or capability introduced early creates an implicit promise that it will become significant later (setup and payoff).

Key markers: (i) an object, skill, or detail introduced conspicuously early; (ii) appears unnecessary at the moment of introduction; (iii) later resolves a key problem or changes the course of events; (iv) in a synopsis, setup alone qualifies if payoff is clearly implied.

Positive (full): SETUP: “He noticed a small hunting knife hidden under the floorboard and moved on.” PAYOFF: “Bound and alone in the cellar, he remembered the knife.” — classic setup-and-payoff structure.

Negative: “Ivan drew his sword and fought the dragon.” — the sword is used immediately; no deferred setup, no promise of later significance.

Edge case: “The narrator mentions three times that the protagonist never learned to swim.” — PRESENT: repeated emphasis functions as a setup, strongly implying future narrative relevance.

[23] Forbidden Zone

Source: Propp, *Morphology of the Folktale* (1968) — functions γ (Interdiction) and δ (Violation).

Definition: A space, object, action, or piece of knowledge explicitly prohibited to the hero. The prohibition creates the conditions for violation and all subsequent action. The prohibition must be explicit or institutionally established.

Key markers: (i) explicit prohibition (“do not,” “never,” “it is forbidden”) or established taboo; (ii) the hero violates or is tempted to violate it; (iii) the violation sets the rest of the plot in motion.

Positive: “‘You dare not look into the eastern wing,’ the tsar commanded. Ivan promised. But three days into his father's absence, curiosity overtook him.” — explicit interdiction followed by violation.

Negative: “The cave was dark and dangerous. No one had returned from it alive. Ivan hesitated at the entrance.”

— a dangerous place, but not forbidden; the danger is practical, not a taboo.

Edge case: “*Everyone in the village knew that speaking the old king’s name after sunset brought misfortune.*” — PRESENT: institutionally established prohibition qualifies even without an explicit verbal command.

[26] Secret Revelation

Source: McKee, *Story* (1997).

Definition: A disclosure of previously withheld information that retroactively reframes the meaning of prior events. After the revelation, earlier scenes mean something different than they appeared to mean.

Key markers: (i) information disclosed that was hidden from reader or protagonist; (ii) the disclosure changes the meaning of earlier events; (iii) the reader experiences a “reread effect”; (iv) often signaled by “*Only then did she realize...*” or “*He had known all along...*”

Positive: “*Only then did she understand: the old beggar woman who had sheltered her had been her own mother, believed dead for twelve years. Every kindness she had received was a mother’s love in disguise.*” — the revelation retroactively reframes all prior interactions.

Negative: “*The messenger arrived and told Ivan that the princess was being held in the eastern tower.*” — new information as exposition; it does not reframe prior events.

Edge case: “*The letter in the drawer contained his father’s confession. He read it now, and everything he had believed about his childhood collapsed.*” — PRESENT: the revelation reframes the protagonist’s entire past, even without the letter’s specific content being given.

[28] Historical Witness

Source: Genette, *Narrative Discourse* (1980).

Definition: A narrative voice or character who testifies to events from a position of historical proximity—someone who was present, who remembers, or who belongs to the same historical moment. The testimony carries the weight of personal or cultural memory and lends narrative credibility.

Key markers: (i) a character who witnessed or lived through the events described; (ii) first-person testimony (“I was there,” “I remember”) or third-person narration grounded in eyewitness account; (iii) the historical grounding is narratively functional.

Positive: “*My grandfather had fought in that war. When we passed the old bridge, he would slow his steps and say: ‘This is where we held the line.’*” — the grandfather grounds the narrative in lived, verifiable history.

Negative: “*The battle had taken place three hundred years ago. The history books recorded that ten thousand men had died.*” — historical setting, not a Historical Witness; no character testifies from personal proximity.

Edge case: “*She had been a child during the revolution. She did not speak of it, but the way she flinched at loud sounds told the story her words could not.*” — PRESENT: embodied memory constitutes Historical Witness even without explicit verbal testimony.

[33] Moral Dilemma

Source: Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (1983).

Definition: A situation in which the protagonist must choose between two options, both carrying significant moral cost. A genuine Moral Dilemma requires that *neither option is clean*; the text makes the cost of both options visible.

Key markers: (i) two options, both with serious moral costs; (ii) the protagonist cannot choose without betraying some value; (iii) both costs are made visible in the text; (iv) not resolved by a third option or a clever trick.

Positive: “*She could save the village by revealing her brother’s hiding place—or she could protect her brother and let the plague spread to three more towns. There was no third way. She had until morning.*” — genuine dilemma: both options carry irreversible moral cost.

Negative: “*Ivan had to decide whether to fight the dragon or run away.*” — a difficult decision but not a moral dilemma; one option is clearly “right,” the other clearly “wrong.”

Edge case: “*He could tell the truth and destroy his family, or lie and preserve it—knowing the lie would eat at him for the rest of his life.*” — PRESENT: both options carry moral cost; the internal cost of the second option suffices to qualify.

[37] Fate vs. Choice

Source: Aristotle, *Poetics* (c. 335 BCE).

Definition: The tension between what is predetermined (destiny, prophecy, structural inevitability) and what the protagonist freely decides. Both elements must be active: a force of fate *and* a moment of genuine choice.

Key markers: (i) a prophecy, curse, or structurally inevitable outcome is established; (ii) the protagonist attempts to resist, fulfill, or navigate this destiny; (iii) a moment of genuine choice occurs within the fateful framework; (iv) the text makes visible the tension between the two forces.

Positive: “*It was written that the youngest son would destroy the kingdom. Ivan, knowing nothing of the prophecy, chose on his own to climb down and seek his fortune—each step of his free will walking him closer to the foretold catastrophe.*” — prophecy (fate) + independent choice + tension between them.

Negative: “*Ivan decided to leave home and seek his fortune. No one had predicted this. He simply chose to go.*” — pure choice with no fateful framework.

Edge case: “*She had always known, in some wordless way, that she would return to this village. And now, without planning to, she had.*” — UNCERTAIN: qualify as present only if the text develops this tension further.

[38] Reconciliation Scene

Source: Aristotle, *Poetics* (c. 335 BCE) — *anagnorisis* + *peripeteia*.

Definition: A scene of recognition (*anagnorisis*) combined with reversal (*peripeteia*), in which estranged characters acknowledge each other’s true nature, leading to emotional resolution. The reconciliation must involve genuine change in the relationship—not merely a meeting or truce.

Key markers: (i) characters who were estranged, opposed, or in conflict; (ii) a moment of recognition: one or both understand something they did not before; (iii) the recognition changes the emotional or moral terms of the relationship; (iv) resolution follows from understanding, not external force.

Positive: “*For the first time, the father looked at his son—not as the disappointment he had always seen, but as the man his son had become. ‘I did not know,’ he said. Something between them, long broken, quietly mended.*” — mutual recognition + change in relationship terms + emotional resolution.

Negative: “*The two brothers agreed to a truce. They divided the land equally and went their separate ways.*” — a negotiated settlement, not a Reconciliation Scene; no recognition, no change in understanding.

Edge case: “*She forgave him. He did not ask for forgiveness and did not fully understand why she gave it. But she forgave him anyway.*” — UNCERTAIN: one-sided recognition; qualify as present only if the text shows that the forgiveness constitutes a form of mutual acknowledgment.

Appendix B: Agreement

	At the score level			At the quote level		
	Claude– Gemini	Claude– DeepSeek	Gemini– DeepSeek	Claude– Gemini	Claude– DeepSeek	Gemini– DeepSeek
P_o	0.67	0.72	0.69	0.74	0.77	0.77
P_e	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.50	0.50	0.50
κ	0.33	0.44	0.40	0.48	0.54	0.54
mean κ		0.39			0.52	

Table 4: Cohen’s κ at two levels: score-level (binarized confidence scores) and quote-level (verbatim textual evidence)

Appendix C: Per-device Krippendorff’s α

Rank	Device	Krippendorff’s α
1	Moral Dilemma	0.74
2	Ticking Clock	0.60
3	Chekhov’s Gun	0.60
4	Secret Revelation	0.60
5	Fate vs. Choice	0.60
6	Reconciliation	0.60
7	Hero’s Test	0.45
8	Historical Witness	0.33
9	Impossible Task	0.28
10	Forbidden Zone	0.23

Table 5: Per-device Krippendorff’s α at the quote level, ranked by descending agreement.

Appendix D: Matrix of Contradictions

Table 6.1: The Narrative-TRIZ contraddiction matrix.

Improves ↓ / Worsens →	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
1. Narrative Pace	-	9, 14	13, 4	16, 10	39, 40	15, 2	6, 3	9, 14	2, 37	38, 5	3, 17	6, 40	9, 29	28, 4	7, 32	26, 10	17, 18	40, 7	6, 39	11, 36	7, 9	9, 39	7, 28	10, 5
2. Plot Complexity	9, 3	-	13, 4	23, 26	25, 24	15, 20	3, 33	9, 12	4, 8	6, 33	3, 17	5, 40	15, 24	28, 29	25, 15	10, 26	17, 19	34, 37	10, 39	33, 36	13, 9	40, 10	28, 17	10, 14
3. Causal Clarity	4, 4	2, 29	-	27, 31	40, 25	6, 28	33, 8	4, 37	4, 7	6, 10	3, 17	4, 40	4, 29	28, 29	7, 26	10, 31	19, 21	34, 37	38, 39	33, 31	7, 30	40, 4	28, 27	16, 1
4. Suspense/Tension	9, 10	18, 15	27, 25	-	39, 2	20, 25	33, 32	12, 6	27, 18	23, 25	3, 17	35, 25	26, 11	28, 29	2, 32	26, 10	18, 23	35, 25	39, 32	33, 35	9, 10	10, 39	12, 27	10, 5
5. Resolution	39, 2	40, 24	13, 25	10, 26	-	38, 29	38, 2	12, 33	38, 2	38, 2	39, 17	38, 34	38, 29	29, 28	38, 26	26, 38	38, 19	38, 35	39, 38	35, 33	38, 2	38, 10	38, 28	38, 10
6. Timeline	4, 28	40, 20	28, 29	25, 36	40, 38	-	20, 6	37, 20	28, 4	28, 20	17, 17	40, 28	40, 20	28, 4	28, 20	20, 28	20, 19	40, 37	40, 20	28, 37	28, 20	28, 20	28, 20	28, 20
7. Char. Depth	33, 6	40, 8	36, 34	33, 25	2, 34	28, 33	-	33, 6	36, 33	21, 33	3, 17	40, 29	33, 34	28, 33	33, 34	33, 19	33, 34	33, 19	33, 36	33, 33	33, 2	33, 39	33, 28	33, 10
8. Char. Agency	33, 6	6, 8	37, 12	6, 25	25, 24	37, 28	33, 6	-	37, 6	6, 33	3, 17	37, 34	6, 33	37, 28	6, 33	6, 10	6, 19	37, 33	6, 33	33, 37	6, 33	6, 33	6, 28	6, 10
9. Char. Believability	33, 8	37, 8	21, 7	33, 25	2, 28	28, 37	33, 8	37, 6	-	21, 7	3, 4	40, 35	33, 7	28, 21	7, 33	2, 31	21, 7	33, 37	33, 37	33, 37	7, 2	33, 7	7, 28	1, 10
10. Char. Relatability	21, 33	6, 12	21, 7	23, 25	2, 38	28, 37	21, 33	6, 12	21, 7	-	3, 38	34, 40	21, 7	20, 21	7, 21	2, 21	21, 19	21, 21	21, 33	21, 21	21, 2	34, 21	21, 28	21, 10
11. Char. Transform	3, 17	6, 33	4, 7	3, 25	39, 34	17, 2	3, 17	6, 33	4, 7	2, 38	-	40, 34	3, 17	20, 28	7, 17	17, 38	17, 19	37, 33	3, 38	3, 33	17, 33	3, 17	17, 28	3, 10
12. Char. Consistency	40, 34	37, 33	40, 7	35, 25	38, 34	28, 40	40, 34	37, 33	40, 7	21, 34	17, 2	-	40, 7	28, 40	7, 40	40, 38	40, 19	40, 37	40, 38	40, 40	40, 2	40, 34	40, 28	40, 10
13. Info. Density	9, 29	15, 24	30, 7	11, 26	38, 29	28, 20	33, 34	6, 33	7, 33	7, 21	17, 3	7, 40	-	29, 28	30, 7	11, 26	17, 19	34, 26	11, 26	33, 30	30, 7	11, 34	29, 28	1, 32
14. Historical c.	28, 4	28, 29	28, 29	28, 25	28, 28	28, 4	33, 33	37, 28	28, 21	20, 21	28, 20	28, 40	29, 30	-	7, 28	26, 11	19, 21	34, 37	28, 4	28, 37	7, 21	28, 40	28, 29	26, 1
15. Clarity	7, 30	25, 15	7, 26	2, 32	38, 26	28, 20	33, 34	6, 33	7, 33	7, 21	7, 17	7, 40	30, 7	7, 28	-	32, 2	17, 21	34, 7	2, 7	7, 30	7, 25	7, 2	7, 28	7, 2
16. Surprise	26, 10	10, 26	10, 31	26, 10	26, 38	20, 28	33, 34	6, 10	2, 31	2, 21	17, 38	40, 38	11, 26	26, 11	32, 2	-	18, 23	35, 25	26, 31	35, 31	2, 26	26, 10	26, 18	26, 10
17. World-building	17, 18	17, 19	18, 21	18, 23	18, 19	38, 19	20, 19	33, 19	6, 19	21, 7	21, 19	17, 19	17, 18	17, 21	19, 21	18, 23	-	34, 19	19, 21	19, 21	17, 19	17, 17	19, 28	19, 18
18. Thematic c.	40, 7	34, 37	34, 37	35, 35	38, 37	40, 34	33, 34	37, 33	33, 37	21, 37	37, 33	40, 34	37, 34	37, 28	34, 7	35, 25	34, 21	-	34, 33	34, 37	34, 7	34, 34	34, 34	35, 35
19. Emotional c.	6, 39	10, 39	38, 39	39, 32	39, 38	28, 20	33, 36	6, 33	33, 7	21, 33	3, 38	40, 38	11, 26	28, 4	2, 7	26, 10	19, 21	34, 33	-	33, 35	2, 39	39, 34	28, 29	10, 5
20. Intellectual c.	11, 36	33, 36	33, 31	33, 35	35, 33	20, 37	33, 36	33, 37	33, 37	21, 33	3, 33	40, 33	33, 30	28, 37	7, 30	35, 31	21, 19	34, 37	33, 35	-	7, 30	35, 40	28, 21	27, 1
21. Accessibility	7, 9	13, 9	7, 30	9, 10	38, 2	28, 20	33, 2	6, 33	7, 2	21, 2	17, 33	40, 2	30, 7	7, 21	7, 25	2, 26	17, 21	34, 7	2, 39	7, 30	-	34, 39	7, 21	1, 2
22. Memorability	9, 39	40, 10	40, 4	10, 39	38, 10	40, 20	33, 39	6, 33	33, 7	34, 21	3, 17	40, 34	11, 34	28, 40	7, 2	26, 10	17, 19	34, 35	39, 34	35, 40	34, 39	-	29, 34	1, 10
23. Education	7, 28	28, 17	28, 27	28, 12	38, 28	28, 20	33, 20	6, 28	7, 28	21, 28	17, 28	40, 28	29, 28	28, 29	7, 28	26, 18	19, 28	34, 28	28, 29	21, 21	7, 21	29, 34	-	1, 18
24. Entertainment	10, 5	10, 14	16, 1	10, 5	38, 10	28, 20	33, 10	6, 10	1, 10	21, 10	3, 10	40, 10	1, 32	26, 1	7, 2	26, 10	19, 18	34, 35	10, 5	27, 1	1, 2	1, 10	1, 18	-

Figure 1: The Narrative-TRIZ contradiction matrix, adapted from Table 6.1 (Palma 2025). The spelling "contraddiction" is retained intentionally, as it reproduces the original title. The abbreviation "c." stands for "contribution" meaning each parameter measures the degree or presence of a particular quality in the text. Coloured borders mark the cells from which the thirteen conflict pairs in Table 2 were derived.