УДК 82-1.0:159.954.3

ЩЕПАНСЬКА Христина – *кандидат філологічних наук, асистент кафедри українського прикладного мовознавства, Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка, вул. Університетська, 1, Львів, 79000, Україна (khrystynashchepanska@gmail.com)*

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6393-5987

THE LEVELS OF IMAGERY IN THE POETIC TEXT

РІВНІ ОБРАЗНОСТІ У ПОЕТИЧНОМУ ТЕКСТІ

Анотація. *Мета статті – охарактеризувати основні рівні образності у поетичному тексті, визначити їх співвідношення, форми та засоби репрезентації.*

У статті проаналізовано особливості репрезентації чотирьох основних рівнів образності у поетичному тексті. Визначено, що різнорівнева структура образу відображає процес його формування – від «міфу до логосу», де міф – це передзнання та первинні знання, описані у вигляді архетипів і чуттєвих образів, а логос – знання, описані у формі словесних образів.

Охарактеризовано предметно-чуттєвий рівень образності, зокрема визначено, що він представлений архетипами, або першообразами, а також чуттєвими образами, які, на відміну від архетипів, що є колективним передзнанням, формуються у процесі пізнання як відображення у людській свідомості реальних предметів.

Проаналізовано особливості представлення ментального та мовного рівнів образності. З'ясовано, що ментальний рівень передбачає формування концептуальної рамки образу – когнітивного першообразу, в основі якого внутрішня форма слова. Мовний рівень образності у поетичному тексті представлений поетичними метафорами, фразеологізмами та символами. Окреслено послідовність процесу формування словообразу на лінгвальному рівні.

Охарактеризовано комунікативно-прагматичний рівень образності, де ключовим є поняття концептуально-семантичної сполучуваності словообразу. Визначено алгоритм опису механізму формування словесного образу на цьому рівні.

Підсумовано, що у поетичному тексті в основному представлені чотири рівні образності: предметно-чуттєвий, якому відповідає передконцептуальна форма об'єктивації образу, ментальний (концептуальна форма); лінгвальний, що репрезентує вербально-поетичне конструювання образу (мовна форма); комунікативно-прагматичний, де об'єктом дослідження є системні зв'язки словесного образу з текстом (дискурсивна форма). Перспективу дослідження вбачаємо у детальному аналізі кожного рівня структурування образу на прикладі конкретних поетичних текстів.

Ключові слова: образ, образність, предметно-чуттєвий образ, архетип, метафора, символ.

Formulation of the problem. Semantics of the poetic vocabulary has some peculiarities. Language image as a complex mental-linguistic category that organically combines stereotypical and author's models of a certain fragment of reality is in its basis. An analysis of the language-poetic essence of the image is associated with the levels of its structuring. There is a differentiation of the image in the collective unconscious at the sensory level with the outline of archetypes and perceptual channels of psychological communication with the material. The mental level of structuring the image is associated with the definition of its semantic framework based on the basic concepts. At the verbal level image is objectified in metaphorical, phraseological and symbolic units. And, ultimately, the communicative-pragmatic level is an image in its intra- and intertextual ties.

Analysis of the investigations. The concepts of *imagery* and *image* are very important in modern linguistics, in particular in such areas as cognitive linguistics and linguistic culturology. The leading Ukrainian researchers in these fields have repeatedly addressed them, in particular L. Bieliekhova («Словесний поетичний образ в історико-типологічній перспективі: лінгвокогнітивний аспект», 2002), T. Vilchynska («Концептуалізація сакрального в українській поетичній мові XVII–XVIII ст.», 2008), M. Holianych («Внутрішня форма слова і дискурс», 2008), V. Kononenko («Концептологія в лінгвістичному аспекті», 2006), N. Slukhai and Yu. Mosenkis («Мовна символіка і міфопоетика текстів Тараса Шевченка», 2006). An *image* is a psychological category which plays an important role in cognitive processes [8, 101]. It is a «base, on which symbol and sign is built above» [2, 310]. A basic difference between languages, after R. Langacker, is that they «code the same conceptual structure by means of substantially different images» [21, 109].

The term of «image» is multi-valued. For example, O. Potebnia uses the term of «image» in several ways: as a means of reality representing, «an act of consciousness» [12, 42]; the structural element of the symbol, its «internal form» [12, 47]; an idea (component of the word) [12, 119]; objectified in the «external form» (word) artistic and poetic construct [12, 47]. Consequently, there is an internal contradiction in the interpretation of this notion which can be avoided by considering the image at different levels of its structuring.

With the image begins the process of learning, and the means of image's naming is the linguistic sign [1, 101], therefore it is necessary to distinguish between the sensory image and the language image. The sensory image as the initial stage of cognition is considered by most researchers (in particular M. Alefirenko, N. Arutyunova) as the basis for the creation of a concept, symbol, metaphor, and other linguistic categories: this is the structural element of each of them, whereas the linguistic image is a complex reflection of the element of reality by means of the language [1, 101].

The purpose of the article is to characterize the main levels of imagery in the poetic text, to determine their correlation, forms and means of representation.

Presentation of the main material. The multilevel structure of the image reflects the process of its formation – from «myth to logos», where the myth is a pre-knowledge and primary knowledge, described in the form of archetypes and sensory images, and logos is knowledge, described in the form of verbal images.

At the ***subject-sensory level***, the verbal image is related to the concept. According to V. Kononenko, «the basis of the concept lies in the collective unconscious, the archetype» [10, 6], consequently, the concept arises from a certain archetypal image. K. Jung identified the terms «archetypal image» and «symbol». After K. Yung, the system «archetype/archetype image» operates as the background of the image of reality designing. It is based on the understanding of human's psychics as an element of the collective irresponsible, which reflects in the human's consciousness through sleeps, myths and legends by archetype images [18]. The archetype is «a nerve of a verbal poetic image», since it «provides the formation and the functioning of the latter» [4, 224]. Archetypes are the pre-conceptual form of the representation of a verbal image, its bridge to the sphere of the collective unconscious, where the infinity of manifestations and reflections of the human spirit is encoded.

The sensory image is also differentiated at the subject-sensory level of imagery. Unlike the archetype image, which is the collective pre-knowledge, sensory image is a reflection of the real objects in the human consciousness [1, 115]. It is formed in the process of knowledge as a reflection in the human consciousness of real objects, «the original form of thought» [12, 44]. He arises up as a result of mastering of the object's quality features by the man's sense-organs. A basic source of such image is a visual perception, «although it combines the information, coming from the different channels of the human connection with the world» [2, 315]. According to M. Alefirenko, despite the fact that the subject-sensory image exists outside the language, it is the first source of verbalization of knowledge, which is transcoded in the semantic structure of the linguistic sign in the form of its visual-figurative semantic component [1, 112]. Having formed on the subject-sensory level, the image becomes a part of consciousness.

The mental level of imagery involves the formation of a conceptual framework of the image – a cognitive primary image. Archetype is a pre-knowledge and the cognitive primary image is the result of knowledge. A basis of the latter is the internal form of the word. By V. Rusanivskyi, the center of the image in the poetic work is an internal form [13, 14].

By M. Holianych, the internal form is a «semantic value associated with naming and creating of the image» [7, 34]. The internal form as the basis of the etymological meaning of the word combines the semantic-conceptual features that formed the basis of the name of the concept into a single image and gives knowledge about this unity. It is «not the image of the object, but the image of image» [12, 34].

Within the framework of a poetic work, the internal form of the word is the unity that integrates various conceptual features of the verbal poetic image through

which the act of knowledge is carried out [4, 157], becoming an internal form image. The latter, as well as the internal form of the word, is a part of the emotional and appraisal qualifying activity of consciousness [7, 87]. A characteristic feature of the internal form image is that it is a category of discourse. Combining the meaning of the substantive, attributive, cognitive, axiological nature, which conceptualize the universal attitude of *I – text – world* and determine the structure of discourse [7, 88], the internal form image determines the pragmatic orientation of the latter. The differentiation of the internal form image is the fixation of a certain conceptual framework by the sensory image that defines the parameters of the semantic content of the verbal image.

The structural element of the internal form image is the basic concept, or cognitive metaphor. The notion of «cognitive metaphor» was introduced by M. Johnson and J. Lakoff. These researchers emphasize that metaphors are formed not just in language, but in everyday life, they participate in the structuring of the surrounding reality and control the intellectual activity of man [11, 25]. The emergence of everyday metaphors is associated with the conceptualization of one mental domain through another. It is the way of mental ordering of reality [20, 185]. The domain in the cognitive theory of metaphor is a knowledge structure, and the process of metaphorization is based on the interaction of two knowledge structures – the domain of the source and the target domain [11, 9]. Knowledge within the domain of the source is organized according to the pattern of «image schemas», which include: «container», «surface», «subject», «object», «path», «part-whole» and others.

Consequently, the cognitive processing of the image is carried out at the mental level, as a result of which the image transforms in the «frame», which determines the possible set of meanings.

The linguistic level of imagery in the poetic text is represented by poetic metaphors, idioms and symbols. The metaphor transmits figurative information by individual experience, idioms – by synthesizing collective experience, and the symbol transforms the image into a sign of ethnic culture.

The poetic metaphor is an extension of our daily established system of figurative thinking [20, 232]. It can be understood as the author's version of everyday metaphor. However, if the latter is based on the cross-conceptualization of the two systems of knowledge, the source of the poetic metaphor is linguistic imagery [20, 215]. The artistic metaphor, by analogy with figurative, is a result of the modeling of a verbal poetic image on the subject-sensory basis of another mental image.

A metaphor can be explicitly and implicitly manifested in the artistic poetic language [5, 147]. Considering the relation between the concepts of «comparison», «metaphorical comparison» and «metaphor», A. Vezhbitskaya notes that the difference between them is in deep structures. The researcher offers a way of modeling the semantic differences between these concepts, according to which the comparison is described by the formula «we can say that it could be...», a metaphorical comparison – by the formula «we can say that this could be not ... but...» and the metaphor – «we can say that it is not..., but ...» [5, 144].

The metaphor is a significant «structuring force in semantic change» [22, 19]. It operates so deep and pervasively that speakers consider an inter-domain connection to be as natural as the connections within the same domain [22, 19].

Consequently, the metaphor is regarded as one of the ways of conceptualization at the mental level, and as a means of creating the imagery of a word on the linguistic level. Accordingly we distinguish two stages of metaphorization: the basic conceptual (at the mental level) and verbal-poetic (at the linguistic level).

The process of idiom formation also plays an important role in the creation of a poetic verbal image. Idioms contain a system of images in which people's worldview is fixed and which are connected both with the material and with the social or spiritual culture of the linguistic community. They are a reflection of its cultural and national experience and traditions [16, 215].

Important role in the formation of the linguistic image is played by the symbolization, which is «the method of transforming abstract thought into an image», the process of moving the image from the mental plane to the sensory material form [17, 8]. This is a mental activity that involves not only the functioning and transformation of object images, but also the establishment and disclosure of new connections and relations between them. N. Cherepovska notes that the symbolic level of reproduction of reality involves both the symbolization of forms of reality and the symbolization of the contents of displayed, when the image of the form represents something different [17, 8]. The symbolization of reality in the texts of fiction is associated with the expression of the abstract emotional-sensory code through specific subject-sensory images.

As N. Arutyunova notes, metaphor brings the image closer to meaning, and the symbol leads it in the opposite direction – to stabilize the form [2, 329]. Keeping a special place in the system of language, symbol «serves as a semantic bridge» between the image and sign, because there are both symbolic images and symbolic signs [2, 329].

Consequently, the process of forming of verbal image at the linguistic level can be written in the following sequence: 1) explicit comparison (a metaphor-comparison); 2) implicit comparison (a metaphor); 3) idiom creation process (a phraselogical unit); 4) symbolization (acquisition of a symbolic value).

The communicative-pragmatic level of imagery involves including the image into a text where it is in the corresponding «semantic environment» (O. Simovych). As a component of the poetic discourse verbal image has complex multiplevel relations with the text, therefore, the analysis of the linguistic image at the text level should include a method of identifying the conceptual-semantic connectivity of the verbal image.

Traditionally, in lexical semantics, the term of «connectivity» is understood as the semantic harmonization of words that does not depend on their grammatical characteristics [3, 81]. By the term of «conceptual-semantic connectivity» we mean typical combinations of the name of the image with the words-attributes, which specify or complement its content (intra-image connectivity). These are also syn-

tagmatic relations with other images (inter-image compatibility). By O. Simovych, «the compatibility of words with certain meanings contributes to the deepening of the semantics of the word» and «the creation of a new symbolic unity» [14, 4–5]. The integrity of the image can be grasped by its individual components (intra-image connectivity) and by other images (inter-image compatibility). The finding of intra-image and inter-image connectivity is the first stage in the study of the text relations of the verbal image. The second stage involves its consideration as a complex communicative unit, an element of the cultural code, serving as a kind of mediator in the poetic communication. The text as a «macro-communicative act» includes multitude artistic speech acts, the effectiveness of which depends on the reader's knowledge of the cultural code.

As J. Bartminsky notes, the image of an object in specific statements depends on the communicative purpose [19, 76]. For the most part, this is the desire to convey the emotion that has become a stimulus for the formation of a more complex image. Thus, the process of including of the cultural code into the artistic text can be described as follows: «nonverbal title» (emotion, feeling) is transformed in the author's mind into «complex image» that acquires a symbolic generalization, and eventually unfolds in the text, the basis of which is the linguistic image [9, 190]. Therefore, the mechanism of forming a verbal image on the pragmatic level can be written in such way: the collective unconscious / author's consciousness → «nonverbal headline», or communicative stimulus → cultural code (a set of concepts and symbols formed from «non-verbal headline») → text (concepts and symbols actualized in verbal images) → reader (decoding).

Conclusions and perspectives of further research. Consequently, there are usually four levels of imagery in the poetic text: subject-sensory, which corresponds to the conceptual form of image objectification, the mental (conceptual form); linguistic, representing the verbal-poetic design of the image (language/verbal form); communicative-pragmatic, where the object of research is the systemic connections of a verbal image with a text (a discursive form). The prospect of the study is seen in a detailed analysis of each level of image structuring for example of specific poetic texts.

Література

1. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Спорные проблемы семантики / Н.Ф. Алефиренко. – М. : Гнозис, 2005. – 326 с.

2. Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека / Н.Д. Арутюнова. – М. : Языки русской культуры, 1999. – 896 с.

3. Архангельська А.М. Проблеми лексичної та фразеологічної семантики / А.М. Архангельська. – К. : НМЦВО, 2005. – 240 с.

4. Бєлєхова Л.І. Словесний поетичний образ в історико-типологічній перспективі : лінгвокогнітивний аспект (на матеріалі американської поезії) / Л.І. Бєлєхова. – Херсон, 2002. – 368 с.

5. Вежбицкая А. Сравнение – градация – метафора / А. Вежбицкая. – М., 1990. – С. 133–154.

6. Вільчинська Т.П. Концептуалізація сакрального в українській поетичній мові XVII–XVIII ст. / Т.П. Вільчинська. – Тернопіль : Джура, 2008. – 424 с.

7. Голянич М.І. Внутрішня форма слова і дискурс / М.І. Голянич. – Івано-Франківськ : Видавничо-дизайнерський відділ ЦІТ Прикарпатського національного університету імені Василя Стефаника, 2008. – 296 с.

8. Елисеева О.В. Замещающая функция символа как критерий выделения символического наполнения концептов / О.В. Елисеева // Общественные и гуманитарные науки. – 2006. – С. 100–104.

9. Караулов Ю.Н. Русский язык и языковая личность / Ю.Н. Караулов. – М., 1987. – 261 с.

10. Кононенко В.І. Концептологія в лінгвістичному аспекті / В.І. Кононенко // Мовознавство. – 2006. – № 3. – С. 111–117.

11. Лакофф Дж., Джонсон М. Метафоры, которыми мы живем / Дж. Лакофф, М. Джонсон. – М. : Издательство ЛКИ, 2008. – 256 с.

12. Потебня О.О. Естетика і поетика слова / О.О. Потебня. – К. : Мистецтво, 1985. – 302 с.

13. Русанівський В.М. Структура лексичної і граматичної семантики / В.М. Русанівський. – К. : Наукова думка, 1988. – 240 с.

14. Сімович О. Поетична символіка української народної творчості: лінгвістичний аспект / О. Сімович. – Львів : Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України ; ЛДУ ім. І. Франка, 1999. – 46 с.

15. Слухай Н.В., Мосенкіс Ю.Л. Мовна символіка і міфопоетика текстів Тараса Шевченка / Н.В. Слухай, Ю.Л. Мосенкіс. – К. : Видавничий дім А+С, 2006. – 168 с.

16. Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты / В.Н. Телия. – М. : Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1996. – 288 с.

17. Череповська Н.І. Особливості формування символічного образу в художньо-графічній діяльності підлітків : автореф. дис. … канд. психол. наук / Н.І. Череповська. – К., 2006. – 18 с.

18. Юнг К.Г. Архетип и символ / К.Г. Юнг. – М. : Ренессанс, 1991. – 343 с. – (Страницы мировой философии). – Режим доступа : http://www.wanderer.org.ua/book/psy/jung/arch_sym.htm.

19. Bartmiński J. Podstawy lingwistycznych badań nad stereotypem – na przykładzie stereotypu matki / J. Bartmiński // Język a kultura. – 1988. – T. 12. – S. 63–83.

20. Lakoff G. Contemporary theory of metaphor / G. Lakoff // Cognitive linguistics: Basic readings. – Oxford University Press, 2006. – P. 185–238.

21. Langacker R. Concept, Image and Symbol: the cognitive basis of grammar / R. Langacker. – Berlin; New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 2002. – P. 185–238.

22. Sweetser E. From etymology to pragmatics: metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure / E. Sweetser. – Cambridge University Press, 1990. – 174 p.

References

1. Alefirenko, N.F. (2005). *Spornye problemy semantiki [Controversial problems of semantics]*. Moskva: Gnozis [in Russian].

2. Arutiunova, N.D. (1999). *Iazyk i mir cheloveka [Language and human's world]*. Moskva: Iazyki russkoi kultury [in Russian].

3. Arkhanhelska, A.M. (2005). *Problemy leksychnoi ta frazeolohichnoi semantyky [Problems of lexical and phraseological semantics].* Kyiv: NMTsVO [in Ukrainian].

4. Bieliekhova, L.I. (2002). *Slovesnyi poetychnyi obraz v istoryko-typolohichnii perspektyvi: linhvokohnityvnyi aspekt (na materiali amerykanskoi poezii) [Verbal poetic image in the historical-typological perspective: the linguistic and cognitive aspect (based on the material of American poetry)].* Kherson [in Ukrainian].

5. Vezhbitckaia, A. (1990). *Sravnenie – gradatciia – metafora [Comparison – gradation – metaphor].* Moskva [in Russian].

6. Vilchynska, T.P. (2008). *Kontseptualizatsiia sakralnoho v ukrainskii poetychnii movi XVII–XVIII st. [Conceptualization of the sacral sphere in the Ukrainian poetic language of the XVII–XVIII centuries].* Ternopil: Dzhura [in Ukrainian].

7. Holianych, M.I. (2008). *Vnutrishnia forma slova i dyskurs [The inner form of the word and discourse].* Ivano-Frankivsk: Publishing and design department of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University [in Ukrainian].

8. Eliseeva, O.V. (2006). Zameshchaiushchaia funktciia simvola kak kriterii vydeleniia simvolicheskogo napolneniia kontceptov [The replacing function of symbol as a criterion for allocating the symbolic content of the concepts]. *Obshchestvennye i gumanitarnye nauki – Social and Human Sciences* (pp. 100–104) [in Russian].

9. Karaulov, Iu.N. (1987). *Russkii iazyk i iazykovaia lichnost [Russian language and language personality].* Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].

10. Kononenko, V.I. (2006). Kontseptolohiia v linhvistychnomu aspekti [Conceptology in the linguistic aspect]. *Movoznavstvo – Linguistics*, *3*, 111–117 [in Ukrainian].

11. Lakoff, Dzh., & Dzhonson, M. (2008). *Metafory, kotorymi my zhivem [Metaphors we live by].* Moskva: Izdatelstvo LKI [in Russian].

12. Potebnia, O.O. (1985). *Estetyka i poetyka slova [Aesthetics and poetics of the word].* Kyiv: Mystetstvo [in Ukrainian].

13. Rusanivskyi, V.M. (1988). *Struktura leksychnoi i hramatychnoi semantyky [Structure of lexical and grammatical semantics].* Kyiv: Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].

14. Simovych, O. (1999). *Poetychna symvolika ukrainskoi narodnoi tvorchosti: linhvistychnyi aspekt [Poetic symbols of Ukrainian folklore: linguistic aspect].* Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha NAN Ukrainy [in Ukrainian].

15. Slukhai, N.V., & Mosenkis, Yu.L. (2006). *Movna symvolika i mifopoetyka tekstiv Tarasa Shevchenka [The language symbolism and the mythology of texts by Taras Shevchenko].* Kyiv: Vydavnychyi dim A+S [in Ukrainian].

16. Teliia, V.N. (1996). *Russkaia frazeologiia. Semanticheskii, pragmaticheskii i lingvokulturologicheskii aspekty [Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguistic-cultural aspects].* Moskva: Shkola «Iazyki russkoi kultury» [in Russian].

17. Cherepovska, N.I. (2006). *Osoblyvosti formuvannia symvolichnoho obrazu v khudozhno-hrafichnii diialnosti pidlitkiv [Features of the formation of a symbolic image in the artistic and graphic activity of adolescents].* (Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].

18. Iung, K.G. (1991). *Arkhetip i simvol [Archetype and symbol].* Retrieved from http://www.wanderer.org.ua/book/psy/jung/arch_sym.htm [in Russian].

19. Bartmiński, J. (1988). Podstawy lingwistycznych badań nad stereotypem – na przykładzie stereotypu matki [Basics of linguistic research on the stereotype – on the example of the mother's stereotype]. *Język a kultura – Language and culture*, 12, 63–83 [in Polish].

20. Lakoff, G. (2006). Contemporary theory of metaphor. *Cognitive linguistics: Basic readings* (pp. 185–238). Oxford University Press.

21. Langacker, R. (2002). *Concept, Image and Symbol: the cognitive basis of grammar*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

22. Sweetser, E. (1990). *From etymology to pragmatics: metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge University Press.

SHCHEPANSKA Khrystyna – *Candidate of Philological Sciences, Assistant Professor, Department of Ukrainian Applied Linguistics, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, 1, Universytetska Str., Lviv, 79000, Ukraine (khrystynashchepanska@gmail.com)*

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6393-5987

THE LEVELS OF IMAGERY IN THE POETIC TEXT

Abstract. *The article analyzes features of the representation of the four basic levels of imagery in the poetic text improving the concept of the language image: analyzed notion is considered as a dynamic category providing four consistent forms of the image transformation: psychological, cognitive, verbal, discursive corresponding to four levels of imagery (sensory, mental, verbal and communicative-pragmatic). It is determined that multilevel structure of the image reflects the process of its formation – from «myth to logos».*

Key words: *image, imagery, sensory image, archetype, metaphor, symbol.*

Стаття надійшла до редакції 11.10.2018 р.