

*Materials of Conferences***LINGUOPOETICS TODAY:
ONTOLOGY AND METHODS**

Meshkova E.M.

*Moscow State University of M.V. Lomonosova,
the transfer Higher school, Moscow,
e-mail: yemeshkova@mail.ru*

The article discusses the ontology of linguopoetics and its methods, emphasizing the idea that linguopoetics today is not merely a combination of linguostylistics and literary criticism but a philological discipline in its own right. It also shows the advantages of using the methods elaborated by A.A. Lipgart and his disciples.

«Linguopoetics is a branch of philology that studies stylistically marked linguistic units used in a text of verbal art in terms of their functions and relative value in rendering the artistic content and creating aesthetic effect» (Lipgart 1996: 23). Stylistically marked linguistic units are linguistic units that fulfill the function of impact, or the aesthetic function – one of the three main functions of language according to V.V. Vinogradov's classification (Vinogradov 1968: 6). V.V. Vinogradov's theory has been elaborated further by A.A. Lipgart who explains in one of his articles the distinction between these functions in the following way. The communicative function is «observed in the situations of the «non-specialized» and «non-artistic» communication and is associated with the notion of linguistic norm. /.../the intellectual function is performed in situations of «specialized» communication and is characterized by a more restricted use of linguistic elements, while the aesthetic function/.../ is connected with «artistic» communication and with linguistic units displaying their metaphorical potential to the utmost, one way or another violating or playing upon the norm» (Lipgart 1997: 6).

The theory of linguopoetics developed by A.A. Lipgart and his disciples is in fact a consistent evolution of the ideas of outstanding Russian philologists: V.V. Vinogradov, G.O. Vinokur, V.P. Grigorjev, R.A. Budagov, O.S. Akhmanova and V.J. Zadornova. It has as well incorporated some of the ideas of the Prague Linguistic Circle. A.A. Lipgart defines linguopoetics as a full-fledged philological discipline that has its own aims and object of study. This implies that it also has its own methods of research. These methods have been elaborated and effectively applied by A.A. Lipgart and his disciples (Lipgart 1994, Lipgart 1996, Lipgart 1997, Lipgart, Garkavenko 2001, Kirtaeva 2001, Shmul 2001, Murashkina 2004, Karpova 2009) and include the linguopoetics of an artistic device, linguopoetic confrontation, linguopoetic stratification, and the linguopoetics of narrative types.

The linguopoetics of an artistic device is a typological study which discovers invariant linguopoetic properties of this or that artistic, or poetic, device. For this kind of linguopoetic research to be carried out, the device should be a linguistic unit fulfilling the function of impact and it should be used regularly in a fairly large number of texts. The linguopoetic study of connotative attributive word-combinations in Shakespeare's dramas conducted by A.A. Lipgart (Lipgart 1996: 179-263) established the categories of linguopoetic function and linguopoetic value – the two basic categories of linguopoetics which help to assess the contribution of this or that artistic device to creating aesthetic effect.

Linguopoetic value is the extent to which the semantic and metasemiotic potential of a stylistically marked linguistic unit is realized in the given context. The category of linguopoetic value is constituted by three categorial forms – automatization, linguopoetically valid use, and foregrounding. The linguopoetic function is the role that the given stylistically marked element plays in creating the aesthetic effect that the text produces upon the reader. The category of linguopoetic function is also constituted by the opposition of three categorial forms – the expressive, the gnomic and the associative linguopoetic functions. The linguopoetic function of a stylistically marked linguistic unit depends on its linguopoetic value and on the type of context (narrative or non-narrative) in which it is used (Lipgart 2006: 23-24). The categories of linguopoetic value and linguopoetic function being established, the role of stylistically marked linguistic units in creating the aesthetic effect can be assessed more objectively and not in a form of subjective impressions.

Linguopoetic confrontation is carried out for the purpose of determining the relative value of stylistically marked linguistic elements used in the texts under analysis. The method is based on comparing two or more literary texts which are similar in terms of their content and formal, functional-stylistic characteristics (Lipgart 1996: 273-274).

Linguopoetic stratification aims at singling out different thematic-stylistic strata in a literary text and thereby reveals linguopoetic complexity of the text as a whole. The given method can be applied only to those texts which are characterized by both thematic and stylistic heterogeneity (Lipgart 1996: 421-489).

The linguopoetics of narrative types combines the principles of confrontational and typological research and is based on the theory of narrative types (Karpova 2009: 7). Narrative types can be understood as means of rendering this or that artistic content. They differ in terms of their notional characteristics, and this difference is reflected in their linguistic properties: namely, in the choice of stylistically marked linguistic units and in the ex-

tent to which their linguopoetic potential is realized (Murashkina 2004: 68).

A.A. Lipgart has also established correlation between linguopoetics and linguostylistics on the one hand and between linguopoetics and literary criticism on the other as different (though closely related) branches of philology (Lipgart 2006: 35-109). A linguostylistic analysis aims at differentiating between stylistically marked and stylistically unmarked elements in a text (not necessarily a literary one). Linguopoetic analysis can be applied to literary texts only, and to those literary texts which contain stylistically marked linguistic elements. Literary criticism largely discusses the content of a literary text. A linguopoetic analysis presupposes the study of a literary text as a unity of artistic content and its formal linguistic expression. It is based on the results of the linguostylistic analysis and may take into consideration achievements in the field of literary criticism. However, these three should not be confused. Nor should linguopoetics be approached as a mere «combination» of linguostylistics and literary criticism, for such an approach does not seem to contribute much to the development of linguopoetics and most regrettably affects the results of investigation.

Thus, for example, research conducted by E.B. Borisova (Borisova 2010), though claiming to be linguopoetic, in fact, lacks even a proper linguostylistic, let alone linguopoetic, analysis. Thus, talking about the image of nature in «Death of a Hero» by R. Aldington, Y.B. Borisova discusses the content of Aldington's descriptions of nature and comes to the conclusion that the image of nature in the novel is presented mainly in the form of lyrical digressions which aim at highlighting the contrast between a fragile beauty of nature and the devastating impact of war. However, from a truly linguopoetic point of view, those «lyrical digressions» are actually comprised of passages belonging to different narrative types – description and volition – the choice and functioning of stylistically marked linguistic units being different in these two types of context:

«The lilacs had just unfolded their pale hearts, showing the slim stalk of closed buds which would break open later in a foam of white and blue blossoms. Underfoot was the stouter green of wild plants, spread out like an evening sky of verdure for the thick-clustered constellation of flowers/.../

English spring flowers! What an answer to our ridiculous «cosmic woe», how salutary, what a soft reproach to bitterness and avarice and despair, what balm to hurt minds! When the inevitable 'fruit Ilium' resounds mournfully over London among the appalling crash of huge bombs and foul reek of deadly gases while the planes roar overhead, will the conqueror think regretfully and tenderly of flowers and poets?» (Aldington 1985: 135-136)

The first passage belongs to the narrative type of description. It contains stylistically marked longish postpositional attributes expressed by participial constructions, a comparison («like an evening sky of verdure») and metaphors («the thick-clustered constellation of flowers», «an evening sky of verdure»). Postpositional attributes are linguopoetically valid and fulfill the expressive linguopoetic function in the context of description (i.e. they add to the expressivity of the text). The stylistically marked linguistic units within the comparison and metaphors appear to be interconnected: the noun «sky» develops associations with «constellation», thus these stylistically marked elements are foregrounded and perform the gnomic linguopoetic function in the context of description creating an image of flowers against the background of green plants which look like a constellation of stars in the sky.

The second passage belongs to the narrative type of volition and does not contain longish postpositional attributes. However, it abounds in stylistically marked syntactic units: exclamations, the uses of anaphora, synonymic condensation, syntactic parallelism, and it contains a rhetorical question. Here we can also find automatically used connotative attributive word-combinations. All these stylistically marked elements perform the expressive linguopoetic function, adding a certain rhetorical colouring and enhancing the author's idea of the cruelty of war.

Thus, by applying the categories of linguopoetics we manage to reveal the contribution of stylistically marked linguistic units to creating the particular aesthetic effect: the alternation of narrative types differing in the type of content and in the choice and use of stylistically marked linguistic units helps to draw the reader's attention to a sharp contrast between the enchanting beauty of nature and the horrible effects of war.

It was the understanding of the categorial nature of linguopoetic value and linguopoetic function, the precise definition of these notions, the introduction of the relevant terminology and the elaboration of the methods of linguopoetic research carried out by A.A. Lipgart that contributed greatly to the development of linguopoetics as a scholarly discipline – in fact, its foundation as a scholarly discipline – which has its own object of study, methods of research adequate to its nature, its own notional apparatus and terminology. A scholarly (or scientific) discipline in any sphere of knowledge differs from purely practical understanding and everyday speculations on this or that subject in that it has its own object of study, methods of research, notional apparatus and terminology. Applying the adequate methods of research with the use of the appropriate notional apparatus and terminology ensures the objective character of the achieved results.

References

1. Borisova E.B. Artistic Image in the English Literature of the 20th Century: typology – linguopoetics – translation. – Abstract of the candidate thesis. – Samara, 2010. – URL: http://www.ceninauki.ru/info/page_18437.htm.
2. Vinogradov V.V. Stylistics. Theory of Poetic Speech. Poetics. – M., 1968.
3. Karpova L.S. The Linguopoetic Study of Narrative Types in English Elizabethan Sonnets. – Abstract of the candidate thesis. – M., 2009.
4. Kirtaeva A.V. The Linguopoetics of Multicomponential Attributive Word-Combinations in the English Drama of the 16–18th Centuries. – Candidate thesis. – M., 2001.
5. Lippart A.A. The Bases of Linguopoetics. – M., 2006.
6. Lippart A.A. Methods of Linguopoetic Research. – M., 1997.
7. Lippart A.A. Functional Stylistics: A Thing of the Living Present (Editorial) // *Folia Anglistica*. – 1997. – №1. – P. 5-10.
8. Lippart A.A. The Linguopoetic Study of a Literary Text: theory and practice. – Doctoral thesis. – M., 1996.
9. Lippart A.A. Linguopoetic Confrontation: theory and method. – M., 1994.
10. Lippart A., Garkavenko N. «Irish Melodies» by Thomas Moore: The Linguopoetic Typology of Artistic Terms // *Language philosophy. Functional Stylistics. Linguopoetics*. – M., 2001. – Vol. 1. – P. 161-224.
11. Murashkina A.A. On the Linguopoetic Study of Narrative Types // *Language philosophy. Functional Stylistics. Linguopoetics*. – M., 2004. – Vol. 2. – P. 65-75.
12. Shmul I.A. Linguopoetic Stratification of Literary Texts and the Study of the Author's Individual Style. – Candidate thesis. – M., 2001.
13. Aldington R. Death of a Hero. – M., 1985.

The work was Submitted the International Scientific Conference «Basic Research», Dominican Republic, 13-22 April, 2012, came to the editorial office 27.03.2012.