

Theoretical and Literary Discourses and the Problem of Literary Style

Viktoriia V. Liubetska

Department of Linguistic and Humanitarian Training for Foreigners

Odesa I.I Mechnikov National University, Odesa, Ukraine, 65082

Email: hour.mirgorod@gmail.com

Abstract In this paper, there has been concretized the specification of various theoretical and literary discourses—the eidotic one, the personalistic one and the literary grammar, which found upon different methods and set various research objectives. Hence, it is proved that the vision of “style” is different in each of them. The eidotic theory of literature is characterized by conviction in the importance and advantage of poetic cognition through images. Eidotic comprehension of style is a crucially valuable concept, which characterizes aesthetic perfection, namely, “the correlation of the word picture with something which is *Anderssein* for it” (according to A.F. Losev). Among these lines of research, literary grammar is the most epistemological, as it corresponds to the modern European ideal of scientific character. The notion of style within the boundaries of literary grammar is pre-aesthetic, since the sensual, that is, the “inner form” as a plastic-pictorial and vivid component of the image, is not considered. In personalistic discourse, all the problems associated with the perception and interpretation of the literary text, are transferred to the sphere of intersubjective relations. Dialogical relations—relations between the subjects of utterance—are the objects in personalism. In the personalistic theory of literature, the author-creator is the constitutive moment of artistic creation. Literary style is a method of “aesthetic consummation,” which is not conceivable without the finishing ability of the image, that is, the concept of style in personalism is post-aesthetic. The article states the main difference between academic theories of literature and philological theory, which lies in the attitude toward language. The essence of the philological theory is determined by interrogative thinking, different from the representative thinking, which underlies the modern theory of literature.

Key words theoretical and literary discourse; literary style; eidotic; author-creator; content form; representative thinking; interrogative thinking

Author Viktoriia V. Liubetska, Odesa I.I Mechnikov National University,

Associate Professor at the Department of Linguistic and Humanitarian Training for Foreigners, Candidate of Philological Science. Scientific interests: problems of the theory and history of literature (poetics of art, discourse, style, genre, ontology of poetic creativity).

Introduction

In the present article, we cater to three areas in the modern academic theory of literature, to the theoretical and literary discourses: eidotic discourse, personalistic discourse and literary grammar. We have to comprehend the difference between these discourses and to show how “the style” is regarded within each of them. It stands to mention separately the “philological” theory, that is constituted beyond the limits of the considered theoretical and literary discourses, which objectify and dematerialize the stylistic harmony.

Modern theoretical and literary discourses differ in the subject of study, and, consequently, in methodology. Their scientific character is preserved only within the limits of the corresponding methodology, and poetry is the subject of scientific research within the boundaries of various discourses. At the core of the current areas of the modern academic theory of literature lies the representative thinking, whereas the basis of the “philological” theory is the interrogative thinking¹. Through the differentiation of cogitation patterns, it is also possible to distinguish between the ways of understanding the poetical work. The first thing that needs to be done is to clarify the origin of the mentioned academic theories of literature. Thus, “the eidotic” (from the Greek εἶδος—look, view, appearance, beauty) theory of literature comes from the theory of the word picture of the nineteenth century. The “literary grammar” issues from theoretical objectives of the founders of OPOJAZ (short for the Russian: “Society for the Study of Poetic Language”), and the “personalistic” theory of literature is based on the theoretical concept of M.M. Bakhtin².

The Eidotic Discourse

In the eidotic discourse, the problem of the representativeness of a poetic word is thought through very deeply. For the eidotic discourse, the poetic representation is objectified in words, and therefore it is the subject of literary-theoretic

1 Domashchenko A. V. *Concerning interpretation and elucidation: the monograph* (Donetsk: The publishing house «DonNU», 2007) 7.

2 Domashchenko A. V. *Concerning interpretation and elucidation: the monograph* (Donetsk: The publishing house «DonNU», 2007) 10.

comprehension. The emanation of various conceptions is the internal form of the literary work, taken to mean “an image” (according to A.A. Potebnya). Picturesque imagery is an external “sensual expression of this or that internally given spiritual life”¹, it is an integral part and feature of belles-lettres. The word picture (artistic image) has an independent and self-sufficient character in the poetic work, it is variable, which is due to the fact that the image in the works of oral lore “always changes, always floats or runs against, always becomes”². Within the limits of the eidotic theory of literature, researchers deal with the problem of the aesthetic completion of the literary work, since the aesthetically completed thing is the one that is realized in space and time and opens up to a visual (poetic) representation. The image, demonstrativeness, and hence representative thinking are from the very beginning relevant for poetry. The essence of poetry can be opened up in visualization, however, the original Truth is conceived in its over-verbal givenness, when the interrogative thinking turns out to be relevant to poetry.

The eidotic discourse presents us an “aesthetically complete literary world, revealed in the visualization”³. The eidotic theory of literature contemplates “expressive faces of genesis” (according to A.F. Losev). “Expressive faces of genesis” are “eidoses,” “picture forms” or images. Since the word picture/artistic image (“eidosis”) is the main category for eidotic discourse, it becomes necessary to turn to the history of this term’s formation. The conception of an “eidosis” was developed in antiquity. (Plato, Aristotle, Neo-Platonists), but it should be noted that the concept of “eidosis” does not always correlate in the minds of ancient philosophers with the notion of “word picture/artistic image.” But the appeal to the theory of “eidosis” in antiquity is important, since then the groundwork for the eidotic theory, which has its further development, was laid. The central problem of Plato’s philosophy is the problem of ideas (eidosis). The doctrine of ideas (eidoses) gives the name to the whole direction in philosophy. What is meant here is the existence of two worlds: the world of ideas and the world of things, or forms. The prototypes, the initial sources of things, are the ideas that underlie the whole multitude of things formed from shapeless substance⁴. “Eidosis” acquires an ontologically independent status precisely in the Platonic philosophy. It was said by Plato, that the world of

1 Losev A. F. *Sign. Symbol. Myth* (M.: The publishing house of Moscow University, 1982) 415.

2 Losev A. F. *Sign. Symbol. Myth* (M.: The publishing house of Moscow University, 1982) 410-415.

3 Domashchenko A. V. *Concerning interpretation and elucidation: the monograph* (Donetsk: The publishing house «DonNU», 2007) 20.

4 Losev A. F. *Essays on ancient symbolism and mythology* (M.: The publishing house «Thought», 1993) 234-235.

“eidos,” the transcendental world of ideas, appears as an assemblage of absolute and perfect examples of conceivable things. Eidotic theory of the twentieth century refers to the ancient heritage, that is, the ancient theory influences the formation of modern theories of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the late-classical and neo-classical philosophies the concept of “eidosis” gets a second wind. On the basis of the ancient concept of “eidosis,” the concepts of unfolding the content of the Absolute idea grow up to its objectification in the *Anderssein* of nature by G.W.F. Hegel, the doctrine of A. Schopenhauer about the “world of rational ideas,” the “eidology” of E. Husserl and many other philosophical theories. The greatest influence upon the theory of literature since the nineteenth century is exercised by G.W.F. Hegel’s system of philosophy. The very concept of “word picture/artistic image” was developed by G.W.F. Hegel as part of aesthetics. G.W.F. Hegel considers art as one of the ways to implement the Absolute Idea. Art is an aesthetic self-knowing of the Absolute Idea. “It is art,” G.W.F. Hegel emphasized,—that drives home the truth in the form of a sensual image, which in its very phenomenon has a higher, more profound meaning and importance”¹. The aesthetic conception of G.W.F. Hegel is built on the basis of the concept of “visualization,” the revelation of which is impossible without resorting to the “image.” The appeal to the “image” as the basis for the perception of a literary work has a deep tradition. So, according to G.W.F. Hegel, it is eye-mindedness that becomes the basis for the interpretation of the work. The essence of the poetic diction is also included in the character of the visualization. In fact, poetic representation is figurative. G.W.F. Hegel as follows gave reasons for the assertion that the poetic representation is figurative: it is figurative in that “it sets before our eyes, instead of an abstract essence, its concrete reality, instead of an accidental genesis—the phenomenon in which we perceive the mind-body principle directly through the very appearance and its individuality in their continuity” Poetry “is not satisfied with abstract comprehension,” but it “gives us a concept in its genesis, the generation—in a certain individuality”; it “removes purely abstract understanding, putting a real certainty in its place”; it is in the “nature and property” of the poetic representation that the “beauty and perfection” of poetry are chiefly composed². The poetic representation is significant for the eidotic theory of literature: “When we in the prosaic comprehension of the work leave aside (reduce) the character of the poetic representation (the form of vision), we destroy the poetic essence of the work itself, although it seems to

1 Hegel G. V. F. *Aesthetics: in 4 volumes. Volume 1* (M.: The publishing house «Art», 1968) 109.

2 Hegel G. V. F. *Writings. Volume 14: Lectures on aesthetics* (M.: The publishing house «Social and Economic Literature Publishers», 1958) 193-197.

us that we analyze it”¹. Visual presentation of the ideas is the sphere where the essence of the artistic work is revealed most deeply and most fully. The content of a fictional work should be developed in such a way so as to get as close as possible to the soul, to the “eidos” of the subject. The conception of visual thinking turns out to be especially attractive, because it lies at the heart of any fictional work. The mythological school, which develops the eidotic theory, gives us the idea of words-images. This school and its representatives studied first of all the mythological imagery of the language, but they do not deal with the ontological characteristics of the “image,” remaining within the boundaries of representative thinking. The word is sacral and meaning-making. It not only transmits the ready thought, but also creates it. Analysis of the poetic word in all its shades, in all its manifestations becomes, eventually, a means for understanding the action of thought, the movement of feeling, the formation and development of an idea. The word has a complex internal structure, the aesthetic—the moment of the word; its sound, figurative and semantic composition acquires a different kind of significance, which is awoken by connections with other words. Interconnected words generate images and give rise to the semantic completeness that makes the representative thought itself possible. It is important to emphasize that for the eidotic theoretical-literary discourse, the artistic content of the poetic work is manifested only in perceptually-based representation (*specie*), for which the word in its linguistic givenness is only a means.

So, as was already mentioned above, the primary teaching for the eidotic theory of literature is the teaching of G.W.F. Hegel on the poetic representation, the comprehension of the essence of which is impossible without the main aesthetic category—the “word picture/artistic image.” An important moment that determines the eidotic discourse is not only the revelation of the concept of the “word picture/artistic image,” but also the setting for the possibility of inclusion into the inner essence of the work of fiction. Within the framework of the eidotic theory of literature, style is an aesthetic category that lies within the boundaries of “representative thinking.” According to G.W.F. Hegel’s classification any representation can be characterized either as a poetic or as a prosaic one. The essence of the poetic work is “in the nature and property of poetic representation,” which is visual, that is why it is figurative. To comprehend the aesthetic nature of a fictional work within the boundaries of representative thinking is possible only through the revealed, objectified in words. It is necessary to bear it in mind during

1 Domashchenko A. V. *Concerning interpretation and elucidation: the monograph* (Donetsk: The publishing house «DonNU», 2007) 83.

the theoretical comprehension of the eidotic vision of the style. The works by A.A. Potebnya remain overwhelmingly important for eidotic discourse. Trying to understand the nature of the poetic word, the scientist notes that in addition to the external, audial form, the word carries in itself also the image constituting the “inner form” that “directs the thought,” thus revealing the content of the word (fictional work), and is also the basic condition for the aesthetic perception of the word. It should be highlighted that the content is revealed in images; therefore one cannot equate the internal form (plastic-pictorial and vivid component of the image,) and the content. The word’s inner form touches the entire structure of the word, it expresses the word meaning picturesquely, being a visualization of the word, and it is the imagery of the language. A.A. Potebny’s theory of the “word’s inner form” uncovers itself to scientists in different contexts, as he understands it either linguistically, thinking of it as of “the nearest etymological meaning,” or from the point of view of literary criticism, speaking about visual representation, about the “lost aestheticism of impression” that can be restored by the “consciousness of the word’s inner form.” A.A. Potebnya feels the boundaries of various discourses, moving freely from one to another, not mixing them, but understanding their tasks from within.

Another important postulate of A.A. Potebnya’s theory is the analogy between a word and a work of fiction. “The word’s inner form” corresponds to the “inner form” of the literary work. The internal form of the fictional work is interpreted by A.A. Potebnya as an “image, ... corresponding to the idea”¹. It can be assumed that, for A.A. Potebnya, the style of the fictional work has the source in the word’s inner form. Then we can speak of the “inner style” of a fictional work as of its “inner form.” In the work of art, the “inner style” comes out, that is, the aesthetic itself in style—is the “inner style” of the literary work.

In the twentieth century, the most influential representative of the eidotic theoretical-literary discourse was A.F. Losev. In his work “The problem of literary style” A.F. Losev defines the style in the following way: “Literary style is the development of the entire potential of a fictional work on the basis of certain over-structural and beyond-literary set courses and its primary patterns, which are felt, however, immanently by the artistic structures of the fictional work”². Style is the correlation of the word picture/artistic image with that which is not itself, with what is Anderssein for it. “If we are able to define in the style of a given

1 Potebnya A. A. *Word and Myth* (M.: The publishing house «Truth», 1989) 165.

2 Losev A. F. *The problem of literary style* (K.: The publishing house «Collegium, Kiev Academy of Eurobusiness», 1994) 196.

literary work something else that is not actually a literary work itself, it means ... that we have entered the field of style”¹. As A.F. Losev puts it, the problem of style is associated with the distinction between “the artistic structure” and its “ontological basis.” It is the main source of style—its “prototype” or “primary pattern” and “composition scheme of the work which style is being discussed.” The “inner style” of a fictional work (by analogy with “the word’s inner form”)—this is directly aesthetic, identified with the image as such, taken in the aspect of its expressiveness; “internal” means an aesthetically given one. It may be said that style is a high tension of thought, striving for an aesthetic ideal. It expresses the elements of form and content; this is both a material phenomenon and an “Anderssein of a thing” (A.F. Losev) at the same time. Within the eidotic theory of literature, it is important to “comprehend” and to “clarify” the inner form of a literary work filled with symbolic meaning. Therefore speaking of the style of a fictional work within the boundaries of this discourse, we must comprehend the images “created by the representative spirit in their national and temporal originality, bearing in mind the subjective creative manner”². A purely rational and reasonably discursive understanding deprives us of a significant style component, the “inner” style, which acts as the “genuine soul” of the work, as its aesthetic component. Eidotic theory of literature objectifies the “inner” form of the work, trying to consider a work of art in a purely artistic aspect. But referring to the formalized side of art (an image), we are also turned to the implication—deep meaning (the prototype), which arises in the inextricable connection with a specific literary form and has a real objective reality only in it. “Figuratively presented” is thematized in the “eidotic” understood style. Consequently, the “eidotic” vision of style is the correlation of the word picture/ artistic image with that which is Anderssein for him. This is a fundamentally value-based concept that characterizes aesthetic perfection, the highest degree that art can achieve.

The Literary Grammar

At the outset of the twentieth century the question of definition of literary research methods was high on the agenda. The representatives of the formalistic school, and later structuralists, aspired to make the literature searches, including language and style, exact sciences. The principles of specification and concretism of literary

1 Losev A. F. *The problem of literary style* (K.: The publishing house «Collegium, Kiev Academy of Eurobusiness», 1994) 172.

2 Hegel G. V. F. *Writings. Volume 14: Lectures on aesthetics* (M.: The publishing house «Social and Economic Literature Publishers», 1958) 361.

science, the development of clear methodology became the focus of interest for literary grammar. Denying unprincipled mixture of sciences, the representatives of literary grammar strain after high level of theorization. The approach, striving for theoretical nature, has both its advantages and disadvantages. The search for a cognition method takes on a dimension. But, having provided themselves of the methods of their science and not going beyond their limits, literary grammar “deadens” the work of art. The reality of literary grammar is such that it is relevant to refrain from examining general issues of aesthetics, psychology, and philosophy. Fundamental separation from aesthetics can be called the most characteristic feature. The formalists leave aside a number of common problems (for example, the problem of beauty, the problem of meaning of art and its aims). The representatives of this area focused on “specific” problems of literary criticism. Strong principles of literary analysis, the “axioms” of the science dealing with literature, are being developed in the hope of escaping the methodological discord that characterizes the modern theory of literature. Their main statement has consisted in the fact that the subject of literary criticism as an “exact science” should be the study of the specific features of the literary material that distinguishes it from any other material. It also concerns the cases when this material, through its secondary, indirect features, gives rise to the right to use it as an auxiliary one in other sciences too. Describing the characteristics of literary grammar, we should note a constant dialogue with the Symbolists, in the struggle against whom the literary grammar forms its positions with respect to poetics. Lobbying “for the purity of its subject,” literary grammar consistently refuses to interact with works on the history of culture, psychology, aesthetics, and refuses from their established and generally accepted terminological apparatus. The “refined” terms, different from the “foreign” categorical apparatus, are being formed. Such terminology turns out to be isolated, having a “self-made” look that does not refer the researcher to the conceptual apparatus of any philosophical system or scientific discipline. Striving for the uniqueness of their terminology, the representatives of literary grammar refuse from the “inner form” of the word. Clearly articulating its position, literary grammar accepts and allows etymological and semantic doublets in terminology.

The most important feature of the literary grammar discourse is the orientation toward linguistics. “Instead of the desire, peculiar to the historic literary science, to use philosophy, the history of culture, psychology in the literary investigation, the formalists focus on linguistics, the methods of philological analysis of a work

of art, and on the specific study of the specific features of literary material”¹. It is linguistics that, from the perspective of the representatives of literary grammar, comes into contact with poetics, but approaches language with a different goal. In literary grammar, the material of poetry is the word, therefore the basis for the systematic construction of poetics is the classification of language facts, which is given by linguistics. This was due to the fact that the facts of the poetic language, revealed when compared with the practical language, could be considered in the realm of purely linguistic problems as language facts in general. Thus, the representatives of literary grammar insist on the paramount importance of linguistic material for constructing the theory of literature. Such an approach can not be evaluated as unambiguously positive; therefore, Yu. Kristeva notes that when one turns to a linguistic method in the analysis of a poetic work, the literary object itself disappears “under the weight of language categories.” These language categories constitute a “scientific object” which is “immanent to formalistic discourse and refers to its implicit level, but has nothing or very little in common with its original subject—literature as a special way of signifying, that is, taking into account the subject’s space, its topology, its history, its ideology”².

The language of literary grammar is instrumental. It cannot be “symbolic,” because in this discourse the aesthetic, “inner form” of a literary work, filled with symbolic meaning, is not the subject of conceptualization, as well as the language is not a “house of existence” (according to M. Heidegger). Considering the questions of tone painting and abstruse language, the representatives of literary grammar come to a conclusion that is fundamentally contrary to the traditional opinion: poetic language is not only the language of images, sounds have an independent meaning, and the theory of the word picture (artistic image) is archaic.

The literary grammar, leaning toward precision and specificity, is constituted on the border with linguistics: “Precision is the banner of literary grammar and the main guarantee of its superiority over other directions in the theory of literature”³. However, it should be emphasized that “... it is extremely dangerous to require of the material such a degree of accuracy that it does not have, and cannot have, by its

1 Mashinsky S. *Ways and Crossroads: (from the history of Soviet literary criticism) // Literature issues* (1966, No. 5) 74-75.

2 Kristeva Yu. *The Destruction of Poetics // M.M. Bakhtin: pro et contra. The creativity and heritage of M.M. Bakhtin in the context of world culture* (St. Petersburg, 2002) 10.

3 Domashchenko A. V. *Concerning interpretation and elucidation: the monograph* (Donetsk: The publishing house «DonNU», 2007) 13.

very nature”¹.

The representatives of this discourse have outlined the revision of A.A. Potebnia’s general theory, built on the assertion that poetry is thinking with images, and they have made the aesthetic orientation of his poetics the main object of their criticism. The most indicative in this regard is the work by V.B. Shklovskiy “Art as an approach,” which points to the difference between the poetic and the prosaic images. The article begins with objections to the main fundamental principles of A.A. Potebnia concerning imagery and the relationship of the image to the explained. V.B. Shklovskiy points out, among other things, that images are almost immovable, they are “unchangeable,” and therefore are rarely created by a poet. For V.B. Shklovskiy the images are given, and in poetry there is much more memory of images than thinking by them: “Visual thinking is not in any case what unites all kinds of art or even all kinds of verbal art, it is not that, the change of what constitutes the essence of the movement of poetry”².

The poetic image is defined as one of the means of a poetic language—a device equal in its task to other methods of poetic language: simple and negative parallelism, comparison, repetition, symmetry, hyperbole, etc. The notion of the image was pushed into the general system of poetic devices and lost its role, dominant in theory.

In the article “Potebnia” V.B. Shklovskiy once again accentuates that imagery, symbolism do not constitute a specific difference between the poetic language and the prosaic (practical) one: “Poetic language differs from prosaic language by the perceptibility of its construction. Either acoustic, or pronouncing, or semasiological side can be felt. Sometimes one can perceive not the structure, but the construction of words, their location. One of the means to create a tangible, experienced in its very fabric construction is a poetic image, but it is only one of the means. The creation of scientific poetics should be introduced with the factual recognition, based on mass facts, that there are “poetic” and “prosaic” languages, the laws of which are different, and with an analysis of these differences”³.

It is the discussion with A.A. Potebnia that has an important influence on the formation of its own position in science. Having started his work with the

1 Likhachev D. S. *On the accuracy of literary criticism // Literary trends and styles: collected papers, dedicated to the 75th anniversary of G. N. Pospelov* (M.: The publishing house of Moscow University, 1976) 15.

2 Shklovskiy V. B. *Art as a method* URL:<http://www.opojaz.ru/manifests/kakpriem.html> (Date of access: 10.03.2020).

3 Shklovskiy V. B. *Potebnya* URL: <http://www.opojaz.ru/shklovskiy/potebnja.html> (Date of access: 10.03.2020).

question of verse sounds, as with the most fundamental question for that time, the representatives of literary grammar related to a number of basic questions of poetics. Poetry as thinking by images is denied; literary grammar seeks to give priority attention to language, rhythm, sound and syntax. Having refused to interpret the literary text from an aesthetic point of view, literary grammar gives preference in the analysis to the formal side.

For literary grammar natural-science knowledge with its orientation to accuracy and objectivity is the reference point and the ideal of scientific character. Within this discourse, the conviction of the coincidence of the true and the rational dominates. The desire for a purely rational development of knowledge caused such rejection of the eidotic theory. It also becomes clear that the literary grammar seeks to work within the boundaries of the instrumental language, and the maximum possible purity of this language is its deliberately formulated goal. The literary grammar dematerialises the external form of the fictional work and differs in the depth of the interpretation of the intratextual relations, but can not profess the conclusions of aesthetic or ontological nature. The elements of the external form of a literary work are considered in this discourse in isolation from its internal form and from the content. So the style was characterized as “the unity of literary devices” and it was protected of the contact with the internal form. In literary grammar, distinctive marks and style features are recognized as the construction of a literary work, the scheme by which it is constructed, which motivates the appearance of certain “distinctive marks” of style. At the same time, it was forgotten that artistic creation can not be reproduced as some kind of mechanical construction principle, because the style combines “the predictable,” that is, the recognizable, and “the unpredictable,” unrepeatable. The characteristics of style that are so to say on the “surface” of the literary work, are the result of processing the linguistic material. But, in this case, there remains without attention a certain generating principle that is in the depth of the artistic creation. After all, the style of a literary work is some kind of self-sufficient aesthetic value.

Therefore, literary grammar does not set itself the task of revealing the style of a literary work as the unity of all the moments of artistic form and content, but it helps to identify the specificity of one of the essential style components—the language. Characteristic linguistic properties of a literary work are the subject of literary grammar, while the “core” of the image, its “inner form,” being a non-linguistic phenomenon, remains beyond its understanding. At the same time, no one, of course, denies that the language expression, special “queerness” of the syllable are of great importance for understanding the whole work.

According to A.A. Potebnia, we call the visual image, its very actualization in the word—the “internal form.” Equating the “visual image” to the “signs of style,” this discourse appeals to the “external form,” to the “semantic shell,” which can not reveal the aesthetic and content-related nature of the poetic work. According to this approach, style is a systemic unity of formal components, or style bearers—of composition, generic and genre features, language. Without attention there are such style categories as the ratio of the objective and the subjective in style, figurativeness and expressiveness, the main attention is devoted to the use of language means for certain ideas. Thus, the idea of style within the limits of literary grammar is pre-aesthetic, since the sensual, that is, the “inner form” as a plastic-pictorial component of the image is reduced. Interpretation in the field of literary grammar is of constructive and technical nature.

The Personalistic Discourse

The third direction in the modern academic theory of literature is the personalistic one; its founder was M.M. Bakhtin. The primary reality of artistic creativity for M.M. Bakhtin is a situation of communication, which generates new meanings. The subject of the “personalistic” theory of literature are “voices and dialogical relations between them,” their interaction and mutual illumination opens up the boundless (unaccomplished) semantic perspective of the work¹. This is because personalism is focused more on “semantic” rather than purely aesthetic combinations. Considering the generation process of the personalistic discourse in the works by M.M. Bakhtin, it should be noted that philosophical views of the scientist were formed in the mainstream of neo-Kantianism. In his writings, polemics is evident, and hence, becomes obvious connection with the concepts of H. Rickert, H. Cohen, M. Buber. We can say that the creativity of M.M. Bakhtin belongs to the hermeneutic philosophical tradition, it is the tradition of the sciences of the spirit, hermeneutics, marked first of all by the names of F. Schleiermacher, V. Dilthey, M. Heidegger, and H.-G. Gadamer. Interaction with hermeneutics is one of the key moments for personalistic discourse, since it is this philosophical school that turns to the interpretation of texts, being, according to H.G. Gadamer, a classical discipline engaged in the art of understanding texts². However, M.M. Bakhtin himself claimed that “from the students of E. Husserl ... I was most of all closer to Max Scheler and his personalism. Heidegger somehow almost completely

1 Domashchenko A. V. *Concerning interpretation and elucidation: the monograph* (Donetsk: The publishing house «DonNU», 2007) 20.

2 Gadamer H.-G. *Truth and method* (M.: The publishing house «Progress», 1988) 215.

remained outside the field of my philosophical sympathies”¹. In the theory of M.M. Bakhtin there takes place the transformation of the languages of neo-Kantianism, phenomenology, hermeneutics, determining the personalistic dominant of his language. Understanding the dialogue in the theories of M.M. Bakhtin is close to the understanding of dialogue by M. Buber. According to M.M. Bakhtin, the dialogue corresponds to such a situation, when the interlocutor is interested in his partner in his own deep existence, when the interlocutors are directed at each other. Dialogue is more a distinctive feature of a person rather than a special verbal form. A person exists only in interaction with other people: “Life is dialogical by its nature. To live is to participate in a dialogue”². As for the understanding of literary work, M.M. Bakhtin asserts that “genuine understanding in literature and literary criticism is always historical and personified”³. Original categories, formed by M.M. Bakhtin—outsideness, polyphony, participatory thinking, the Other—are precisely characteristic for “personalistic” discourse. Describing the philosophical approach of M.M. Bakhtin, S.S. Averintsev writes the following: “A notionalist who was never tired of repeating that no human word is either final or complete in itself—whether he does not invite us to finish speaking “with respect to” and to assume “tangentially,” either this or that way unwinding the non-cut-off thread of conversation?”⁴

The personalistic discourse tends toward “metalinguistics,” which studies “the word, that is, the language, in its concrete and living entirety, and not language as a specific subject of linguistics, obtained by a perfectly legitimate and necessary diversion from some aspects of the concrete life of the word.”⁵ The key point of the word “metalinguistics” is the prefix “meta”—in this context, which means “over” or “after.” It is a question of a specific methodological transcendence, going beyond the bounds of traditional theorizing, in which there remains essential relationship with that beyond which the solution is accomplished. Therefore, the interpretation of a literary work in personalistic discourse is post-esthetic, acquires its universal significance, approaching the pole of personification. According to M.M. Bakhtin, the dialogue as one of the most important concepts, can only be described within the

1 Bakhtin M. M. *The problems of Dostoevsky's creation. Articles about L. Tolstoy. Records of a lecture course on the history of Russian literature* (M.: The publishing house «Russian dictionaries», 2000) 693.

2 Bakhtin M. M. *Aesthetics of the written word* (M.: The publishing house «Art», 1979) 318.

3 Bakhtin M. M. *Aesthetics of the written word* (M.: The publishing house «Art», 1979) 365.

4 Averintsev S. S. *The link of times* (K.: Spirit and Littera, 2005) 342.

5 Bakhtin M. M. *The problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* (M.: The publishing house «Soviet Russia», 1979) 210.

framework of metalinguistics: “Dialogue relations (including the dialogical relations of the speaker to his own word), are the subject of metalinguistics. In the language as a subject of linguistics there is no, and there can not be any dialogical relations. Among other things, there can not be any dialogical relationship between texts, again with a strictly linguistic approach to these texts”¹. Dialogic communication, “appealing,” according to personalism, is the real life sphere of the language, the word. Linguistics studies the language itself with its specific logic as what makes dialogic communication possible; linguistics does not approach dialogic relations themselves. “Dialogic relations ... are extra-linguistic. But at the same time they can not be torn away from the domain of the word, that is, from language as a concrete entire phenomenon. The language lives only in the dialogic communication of those who use it. Dialogic communication is the real life sphere of the language”². It is obvious that dialogical relations should be studied by metalinguistics, which goes beyond the bounds of linguistics and has its own tasks. The language of the “personalistic” theory of literature is affected by the metalinguistic factors associated with the actual dialogical essence of verbal communication. It is no coincidence that M.M. Bakhtin creates metalinguistic terms with a clear personalistic attitude. Thus, in personalistic discourse “the word” is one of the main objects of attention. All the diverse areas of human activity are associated with the use of language. The exceptional importance of specific forms of the language use lies in the fact that the world of a man, in the words of H.-G. Gadamer, is the language itself. The subject of the personalistic theory of literature is “the expressive and messaging existence,” how it is embodied in a literary work, that is, this discourse is constituted on the border with ontology. Also the author-creator is the constitutive moment of artistic creativity in the personalistic theory of literature. “A single person, a subject, experiences himself as a creator only in art. The positive-subjective creative personality is the constitutive moment of the artistic form, here its subjectivity finds an original objectification, becomes a culturally significant, creative subjectivity...”³. For M.M. Bakhtin “the unity of the aesthetic form is ... the unity of the position of the acting soul and body, the functioning man of integrity, resting on himself”⁴.

1 Bakhtin M. M. *The problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* (M.: The publishing house «Soviet Russia», 1979) 211.

2 Bakhtin M. M. *The problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* (M.: The publishing house «Soviet Russia», 1979) 212.

3 Bakhtin M. M. *The questions of literature and aesthetics* (M.: The publishing house «Belles-Lettres», 1975) 69.

4 Bakhtin M. M. *The questions of literature and aesthetics* (M.: The publishing house «Belles-Lettres», 1975) 64.

Following the arguments of M.M. Bakhtin, style derives from the creative activity of a person and only thus acquires its tangible existence. But you can not say that the style is created by the person consciously and purposefully. A person creates not style, since the style is objective, that is, undeliberate, unintentional; so it can not be the result of a person's subjectively-conscious choice. The style expresses creative originality of the writer, but the style characterizes more "a creative individuality" and "a creative subject" only because the style always has "the memory" of certain style traditions. This, of course, does not mean that the style of a brilliant writer can only be an epoch style or a current style. It should be noted that the ability to perceive a living, thinking author of a work is an essential link in the understanding of the style, although the concept of style does not at all lead to its identification with the subject. Literary style is not only the personal property of an artist, it is also the property of a certain culture, a certain historical epoch, since every style is necessarily historical. However, the personalistic theory of literature believes that "style is a way of being a creative individuality, a way of being an author-person in his creation"¹. In the opinion of M.M. Girshman, the style is endowed with "unifying energy," as a "form-building center" it "concretizes relations," "forms the boundaries," at which meetings, interactions, mutual transitions of participants in the communication process take place. "The correct formulation of the problem of style—one of the most important problems of aesthetics—is impossible beyond the strict delimitation of architectonic and composite forms",—as it was noted by M.M. Bakhtin². For M.M. Bakhtin architectonic forms are "purely meaningful," "but ... we have no basis ... to understand them as a purely content-related category... Architectonic forms ... are determined by innovative take, that is timely for this or that author, for a particular work. And in this sense architectonic forms also belong to the composition"³. Thus, identifying "the aesthetic" and "the content-related" in the literary style, M.M. Bakhtin defines it as "a set of methods for the formation and completion of a person and his world"⁴. In the literary style, the "inner style" and the content are interconnected, and the content is revealed in images. For personalism—the literary style does not work with words, but with the moments of the world, with world and life values, it is a "way of processing" a person and his world, that is, a

1 Girshman M. M. *The Style // Literary Collection* (Donetsk, 2000. Number 3) 255.

2 Bakhtin M. M. *The questions of literature and aesthetics* (M.: The publishing house «Belles-Lettres», 1975) 22.

3 Domashchenko A. V. *Concerning interpretation and elucidation: the monograph* (Donetsk: The publishing house «DonNU», 2007) 99.

4 Bakhtin M. M. *Aesthetics of the written word* (M.: The publishing house «Art», 1979) 169.

way of “aesthetic completion.” However, without the finishing ability of the image, “aesthetic completion” is impossible. M.M. Bakhtin deprives the literary style of the main thing—the inner core, which in the verbal art is the image.

Conclusion

So, each of the considered theoretical and literary discourses of the modern academic theory of literature (eidotic, personalistic and literary grammar) is based on different methods and sets itself various research objectives, respectively—the vision of “style” is different in each of them. To understand what the “philological” theory is and what is its difference from modern academic literary theories, one should clearly understand the difference between representative thinking that is in the metaphysical dimension and interrogative thinking, related to the fundamental ontology. One of the important conditions is the perception of language not as an object of scientific knowledge, but as an ontological basis, which predetermines the very possibility of human thinking, and therefore of scientific cognition. Questioning, addressed to language, to poetic speech is the source of interrogative thinking, within the boundaries of which the essence of philological theory can be understood.

Works Cited

- Averintsev S. S. *The link of times*, K.: Spirit and Littera, 2005.
- Bakhtin M. M. *The questions of literature and aesthetics*, M.: The publishing house «Belles-Lettres», 1975.
- . *The problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*, M.: The publishing house «Soviet Russia», 1979.
- . *Aesthetics of the written word*, M.: The publishing house «Art», 1979.
- . *The problems of Dostoevsky's creation. Articles about L. Tolstoy. Records of a lecture course on the history of Russian literature*, M.: The publishing house «Russian dictionaries», 2000.
- Hegel G. V. F. *Writings. Volume 14: Lectures on aesthetics*, M.: The publishing house «Social and Economic Literature Publishers», 1958.
- . *Aesthetics: in 4 volumes. Volume 1*, M.: The publishing house «Art», 1968.
- Gadamer H.-G. *Truth and method*, M.: The publishing house «Progress», 1988.
- Girshman M. M. *The Style // Literary Collection 3* (2000): 253-257.
- Domashchenko A. V. *Concerning interpretation and elucidation: the monograph*, Donetsk: The publishing house «DonNU», 2007.
- Kristeva Yu. *The Destruction of Poetics // M.M. Bakhtin: pro et contra. The creativity and heritage of M.M. Bakhtin in the context of world culture*, St. Petersburg, 2002. 7-32.
- Likhachev D. S. *On the accuracy of literary criticism // Literary trends and styles: collected papers, dedicated to the 75th anniversary of G. N. Pospelov*, M.: The publishing house of

Moscow University, 1976. 14-17.

Losev A. F. *The problem of variable functioning of poetic language* // Losev A. F. *Sign. Symbol. Myth*, M.: The publishing house of Moscow University, 1982. 408-452.

— *Essays on ancient symbolism and mythology*, M.: The publishing house «Thought», 1993.

— *The problem of literary style*, K.: The publishing house «Collegium, Kiev Academy of Euro-business», 1994.

Mashinsky S. *Ways and Crossroads: (from the history of Soviet literary criticism)* // *Literature issues* 5 (1966: 70-90).

Potebnya A. A. *Word and Myth*, M.: The publishing house «Truth», 1989.

Shklovsky V.B. *Art as a method* URL:<http://www.opojaz.ru/manifests/kakpriem.html> (Date of access: 10.03.2020).

— *Potebnya* URL: <http://www.opojaz.ru/shklovsky/potebnja.html> (Date of access: 10.03.2020).