

Linguistic portrait of a writer as the object of stylistics and history of literary language

LUDMYLA MYALKOVSKA

(Kyiv)

The name of Ivan Nechuj-Levitsky takes a special place in the history of Ukrainian culture. The writer's versatile activities are related to different spheres of life, such as artistic, scientific and publicistic. I. Nechuj-Levitsky was called by Ivan Franko the most prominent Ukrainian writer of the end of the 60 – the beginning of 70 XIX c. Taking into consideration the individual stylistic manner of the author, the researcher stated that:

Levitsky is a good narrator with a sense of humor; his characters are flexible and taken from real life; he strives for their complete ethnic picturing, while the psychological analysis stays in the background. Poetic character of nature descriptions and marvelous language made I.S. Levitsky a readers' favorite in Ukraine and Halychyna (Франко 1950 : 377).

The language of Nechuj-Levitsky's works attracts much attention of linguo-stylists (G.P. Yizhakevych, V.M. Rusanivskyi, O.G. Muromceva, S.J. Ermolenko). So, in a general review *Course of history of Ukrainian bookish language* G.P. Yizhakevych evaluated critically the language of I. Nechuj-Levitsky. In this linguistic research the authoress mentioned that "not everything written by the author has the same artistic-cognitive value" (Їжакевич 1958 : 435). "As to the language – researcher stated – Nechuj-Levitsky's works are not equipollent" (Їжакевич 1958: 435). G.P. Yizhakevych opposes language of I. Nechuj-Levitsky and M. Kocubynsky, telling that the first one lacks deep disclosure of characters' inner world and psychology. Then, the researcher generalized: "we don't find any metaphorical epithets and similes that reflect the complexity of phenomena and characters and are determinant for the next stage of

Ukrainian literary language development in I. Nechuj-Levitsky's works [...]” (Іжакевич 1958: 437). Speaking about the influence of country colloquial language of “the old woman’s language” we should mention G.P. Yizhakevych, who considers that the usage of this vocabulary is undesirable when we speak about author’s works about intelligentsia’s life. But we have to remember that these words helped I. Nechuj-Levitsky to work out his own language for the texts with a country life theme. Compare: “If these colloquial folk-forms in texts on a country topic do not violate the language realism of the writer in general, then we may say that this kind of vocabulary sounds unrealistic and is taken as a stylistic inefficiency of the writer when we speak about texts on the topic of intelligentsia’s life” (Іжакевич 1958: 445). At the same time I. Nechuj-Levitsky grounded “the need of rooting” of so-called “rustic language” into literary, bookish language not only with the help of language creative works, but with the help of theoretical considerations, which were supposed to re-form literary language into a live one” (Іжакевич 1958: 445).

V.M. Rusanivskyi wrote about excessive pasticcio of “folk language” in the artistic manner of I. Nechuj-Levitsky that often led to a bad taste and lowering of the style. Compare: “It can’t be denied that [...] I. Nechuj-Levitsky focused on the language of folklore, but the central place among his descriptive means was given to the language of ‘old woman Paraska and old woman Palazhka” (Русанівський 2001: 237). Among all the individual peculiarities of the writer stated above, the researcher mentioned that “he (I. Nechuj-Levitsky) was close to the language of Marko Vovchok, but he went much forward in the manner of language usage” (Русанівський 2001: 237). It is about an appreciable step of a prose writer in portraying. V.M. Rusanivskyi calls I. Nechuj-Levitsky “the master of landscape”: “You should love your homeland very much to feel and to show the soleness and individuality of your own land in every river, every forest, every mead” (Русанівський 2001: 238). As to the lexical characteristics of the writer, the researcher singles out the conscious usage of words of west European origin but avoidance of the Russian ones (Русанівський 2001).

O.G. Muromceva paid great attention to the research of I. Nechuj-Levitsky’s language and style. The researcher reviews the writer’s contribution into literary language in the article “Ivan Nechuj-Levitsky in the history of Ukrainian literary language”. It is emphasized that the prose writer posited the epic style in Ukrainian literature and showed himself as a master of visual pictures. The researcher considers the writer to be “the most prominent colorist in Ukrainian prose of the second half of the 19 – the beginning of the 20 century, to which only

M. Kocubynsky can be compared” (Муромцева 2008: 156). The authoress supposes that I. Nechuj-Levitsky’s innovation is in displaying his dislike to “oldishness (староття)”, that is why he created new words or he looked for rather rare words in folk language. O. G. Muromceva also pays attention to the favorite models of the prose writer, those which he preferred to generally used. In particular, the researcher singles out such productive words as verbal nouns with the suffix – *ття* (*живоття, розвиття*) and – *ість* (*сухість, житність*) in the group of neologisms. The expressive features of word building elements that add textual dynamism to the texts of the writer are also reviewed by O. G. Muromceva in her article. By stating the point that I. Nechuj-Levitsky introduced cultural loanwords into literary language and activated them in a written practice, O.G. Muromceva proves that “with his work, I. Nechuj-Levitsky answered positively the question about appropriateness of introducing the western European loans and neologisms into Ukrainian literary language; and persisted on an essential correspondence of literary language to changes that are required by time [...]” (Муромцева 2008: 161).

S. J. Ermolenko did the new reading of I. Nechuj-Levitsky’s works in order to find out language-aesthetic signs of national culture. First of all, the researcher pays attention to “a famous Ukrainian landscape and portrait” in writer’s works. According to S.J. Ermolenko’s observations, “the descriptions of Ukrainian nature built up with the help of color play and synonymy of verbal features, belong to language-aesthetic signs of national culture” (Єрмоленко 2009: 121). The researcher singles out comparative constructions (expressions, subordinate clauses) among the characteristic language signs of I. Nechuj-Levitsky’s landscape descriptions. Singling out the compositional role of those structures, the authoress underlines that “similes do not show categorical features, but with the help of reader’s imagination give the possibility to complete the narrator’s image which is very “soft and delicate” (Єрмоленко 2009 : 124) about everything he sees and feels. As to the portrait descriptions of the prose writer, we can say that “the stylistic load is on the simile” (Єрмоленко 2009: 125). Investigating the texts by I. Nechuj-Levitsky, S.J. Ermolenko pays attention to the significant point of the author’s style – that is his mythological perception of the world that influenced greatly the choice of language forms. So, the authoress stated that epithets, similes, personifications of I. Nechuj-Levitsky belong to the means of mythologisation. The researcher refers to observations done by E. Cassirer, who wrote: “Myth has a dual character: on the one hand it is a conceptual structure, on the other hand it is a perceptual structure. If myth couldn’t give the special manner of world perception,

it wouldn't give the opportunity to think it over and to interpret it" (Касцирер 1991, 102). S.J. Ermolenko makes a conclusion that language-aesthetic signs of national culture that are distinctive of the writer's idiostyle have archetypical features of lyric, epic, humorous language mentality of Ukrainian people.

Among linguo-stylistic works devoted to separate stylistic parameters of I. Nechuj-Levitsky's prose language we should mention the works of N.J. Dzubyshyna-Melnyk, V.V. Krasavina, L.O. Stavitska and others. The investigation of I. Nechuj-Levitsky's works in the context of the history of formation and development of literary language remains topical nowadays.

Perception of writer's language personality and his idiolect is done by means of the analysis of texts that reflect language activity of the author. So, we pay special attention to linguo-stylistic analysis of the language of his works to create a language portrait of I. Nechuj-Levitsky in a historical context.

We focus on the ramified lexico-associative field "intelligentsia" in I. Nechuj-Levitsky's works about the life of intelligentsia, about urban environment. In its centre we can find the image that is conceptual for the writer's works. First of all, we should remark that the verbal image of *intelligentsia* in the writer's texts is based on the associative relations of this name and thematically close notions. These are the names of people according to their sphere of activity, profession (*professors, students*) on the one hand, and the words that are used to show inner world of a person (*thought, idea, science, knowledge, enlightenment etc.*) on the other hand.

Taking into consideration the textual representation of the "intelligentsia" image in the investigated texts, we pay attention to the key component of the image being analyzed – the name *European*. This notion functions in a mini-text, where the author clearly defines his position as to the Ukrainian intelligentsia belonging to civilized European world and its European choice, example: – *We became Europeans, though we do not mention it ourselves. Only we need national ground, people, our language, our native poetry, - said Radjuk (v. 2: 261).*

Let us remark that the words *European, Europe* are significant in I. Nechuj-Levitsky's texts and they have symbolic meaning, as it is an important motif of writer's idiostyle of Ukraine and Europe relation in general and the relation of Ukrainian intelligentsia with European world in particular. All the words stated above form a conceptual macro field "Europeaness", which is connected with a high level of development of culture and society in general, example – *We should teach them [...], we should enlighten them with nowadays European ideas [...]* (v. 2: 140).

The evaluative characteristics of the activity of intelligentsia is embodied in the following author's paraphrastic expression:

Our intelligentsia in our cities is an oasis among Ukrainian people, but not that joyful oasis of Sahara, but it is better to say that it is more like an oasis of sand and stones among fertile and prolific field. Intelligentsia with a foreign dead bookish language similar to Latin of medieval centuries, that is useless in the country, except for the government for russification and centralization (v. 5: 159).

The motif of comprehension of the role of the group of people in assertion of national idea and its agreement with other social movements is conceptually important for describing the image of *intelligentsia*. It is about *nationalism*. In I. Nechuj-Levitsky's language this concept is usually expressed with positively marked literary definitions, especially through the usage of antithesis. Abstract words, logical exposition and generalization are usual for such analysis, for example:

Our nationalism is freedom, progress, humanism: it's a new nationalism, and not the old one; it is tolerant to other nations and to any religion, it is for the masses and for the people. And to serve the people, one should talk to them their own language [...] (v. 5: 158).

I. Nechuj-Levitsky's artistic thinking holds the epithet *gold* in the same lexico-associative field as the above reviewed conceptual notions. As a rule these epithets are word combinations with an attribute *gold* that function in appearance descriptions of members of intelligentsia and are characteristic of their clothes or jewelry. Compare:

The officials wore gorgeous clothes; gold rings with diamonds glittered on their fingers (v. 5: 148).

Colourname *gold* is not only the productive means of visual characterization of characters but also distinctive word of mini-space descriptions where the characters are (to be more specific – the picture of inner space of the dwelling). For example: *Two wonderful pictures of great artistic work hung on the walls covered with silver wall papers with golden patterns on them* (v. 8: 269). These epithets (with the adjective *gold*) characterize the outer image, circumstances that rule the life of an urban person because they are indispensable attributes of everyday life, of characters' mode of life.

The epithet *gold* and the word with the seme “gold” belong to artistic details that define the character description of members of intelligentsia, and their interests in particular. The significant contexts are those, where the notions “books”, “magazines” are accompanied by the epithet *golden framed* (золотообрізний) in other words “*gold-covered* (золотобережний)” (Dictionary Greenchenko v. 2: p.179): *Radjuk gave her some books, new magazines and Shevchenko’s “Kobzar” wrapped in red saffian and with a gold-covered binding* (v. 2: 188). Actualization of the seme-colour “gold” in epithets (which serve as the attributes) such as *gold-covered* and *golden framed*, as to the characteristics of *books*, proves the time characteristics of I. Nechuj-Levitsky’s works: it is about a certain social and historical time, a certain part of reality where the books had a proper design – “*golden cover* (золоті береги)”.

A characteristic feature of author’s idiostyle is the metonymic usage of the noun *city*. In modern literary language the word *city* is used in the meaning of “people who live in the city, in other words - citizens”, though 11 volumes of SUM do not state this meaning. Meanwhile, in I. Nechuj-Levitsky’s prose we run into the metonymy “*city*” which is proved by certain artistic contexts, especially with the combinability of the noun *city* with such verbs as *talked, moved, fell asleep, kinks, knows*. The seme “great number of people” is brought to the forefront in metonymic usage of the word. Example: *There are great festivals here, in his spare time Odes rests from problems and work here* (v. 5: 162).

Together with the metonymic meaning of the noun *city* the author succeeds in depicting great number of people. That is the list of people with accordance to their age, financial position; the list, where semantic confrontation of substantivised words plays the role of a decorative detail. All those names in one line make the verbal image of the *city community*: *It was a splendid evening, the sunset was red and bright, the air was warm and quiet that the whole Kiev, all little and big, poor and rich ran outside. Tsarcky’s garden, road above the Dnipro, mountains, everything was covered with people who enjoyed themselves, chatted, had fun swarming around the lanes of the garden where the orchestra played* (v. 2: 79).

In the author’s works we pay attention to the vocabulary that describes the sphere of inner psychological state. These are the words as *thought, soul, heart, dream, feeling* etc. They are of frequent usage and they form a basis for metaphorical contexts, comparative constructions and literary definitions.

The typical verbal metaphors with the key words such as *thought, soul, heart, feeling* are used to create the inner state of a person. Example:

Linguistic portrait of a writer as the object of stylistics

LUDMYLA MYALKOVSKA

His thoughts (Komashka's) went with an ease (v. 5: 214); [...] my soul will cheer up and play as if a swallow in the sun (v. 3: 117); - I heard my heart to sing a wonderful song, sang it endlessly [...] my heart sang an endless song about happiness, love. I wish that wonderful dream lasted forever to make my soul sing a love song for my sweet-heart (v. 2: 353).

There are two tendencies present in the text under analysis, the first one is the formation of personification images which are to be above conceptual notions, and the second one is a maximum concretization of their semantics in sensory verbal images. The sphere of perfection arises in a verbalized subject concreteness that shows the universality of the text language and its correlation with general language tradition or author-individual style.

The same as the conceptual lexemes, the expressive semes of emotive character (*boredom, sadness, sorrow* etc.) add some clarity to the inner state of the character. Example: *Sadness, sorrow and anger wrapped Eremija's soul* (v. 7: 166).

Fixed genitive metaphors, alike verbal ones, reflect the inner state of the person, her mood, feelings and emotional experience, for example: *joy of heart, sorrow of heart, peace of heart, drowse of thoughts, peace of mind, sorrow of soul* etc. Occasional semantic relation is a characteristic feature of author's individual metaphor *the book of man's heart* (v. 5: 294).

The structures with objects which are people's names predominate among comparative constructions in I. Nechuj-Levitsky's prose works. This lexico-thematic group is presented by the great number of constituents of the type *boy, old man, orphan, hetmans, kozaks, voevode, merchants, bourgeois* etc. For example: *She (Martha) went from house to house and gave orders to servants as if a voevode to his army* (v. 2: 58).

The intensity of literary definitions in the system of stylistic language means in the works being analyzed is fixed. To author's stylistic syntax characteristic features belong the definitions of such generalized notions as *life, man, love*. For example: *Love is a great mental force!* (v. 5: 133); *Human's life is like a sea, it splashes, it excites; sea after sea, until it is stopped by the rock and disappears quietly in a deep abyss ... But we should hold out against it, we should fight [...]* (v. 5: 177). The deep semantics of such figures of speech is based on the mechanism of comparison of different conceptual spheres.

So, depicting the linguistic portrait of the writer as the object of stylistics and history of the Ukrainian literary language presupposes linguistic and stylistic analysis of the texts in which the speech is realized as a bearer of idiolect.

Literatura

- Єрмоленко С. Я., 1988, *І. Нечуй-Левицький: портрет, пейзаж*, „Українська мова і література в школі”, №10, с. 61–65.
- Єрмоленко С.Я., 2009, *Мовно-естетичні знаки української культури*, Київ: Інститут української мови НАН України.
- Єрмоленко С.Я., 1999, *Нариси з української словесності (стилістика та культура мови)*, Київ: Довіра.
- Їжакевич Г. П., 1958, *Мова творів І. Нечуя-Левицького. – Курс історії української літературної мови*, ред. І. К. Білодіда, т. 1 (дожовтневий період), Київ: Вид-во АН УРСР.
- Кассирер Е., 1991, *Опыт о Человеке. Введение в философию человеческой культуры*, „Философские науки”, №7, с. 102.
- Муромцева О., 2008, *З історії української літературної мови. Вибрані праці*, Х. Неучуй-Левицький І., 1965, *Зібрання творів [у 10-ти томах]*, Київ: Наукова думка, т. 1–9.
- Русанівський В.М., 2001, *Історія української літературної мови [підручник]*, Київ: АртЕк.
- Словник української мови, [в 11-ти т.], Київ: Наукова думка, 1970–1980.
- Франко І., 1950, *Нова українська література*, Київ, с. 376–377.

Linguistic portrait of a writer as the object of stylistics and history of literary language

Specific of language and creativity of I. Nechui- Levytskyi's in the context of history of Ukrainian literary language is outlined. The analysis of idiostyle writer is carried out after presence in the artistic texts of conceptual lexical units which form lexical-associative field “intelligentsia”. The basic structural and semantic types of metaphors are considered with key words dream, idea, heart, soul. Activity of comparisons and artistic definitions is marked in the system of figurative and stylistic language means of the researched prose. The last definitions are concerned such concepts, as “intelligentsia”, “nationalism”, “life”.

Keywords: *linguistic creation, idiostyle, verbal metaphors, lexical-associative field, verbal metaphors, comparisons, artistic definitions.*