

Halyna M. Syuta (*Kyiv*)

## Poetic Norm in Categorical System of Contemporary Linguostylistics

✦ Кључне речи:  
*poetic norm, stability of norm, variability of norm, temporal, spatial and idiosyncrastic dimensions of poetic norm..*

The concept of norm is one of the main notions in linguostylistics and linguopoeitics. Traditionally, it operates as a category of general theory of language and theory of poetic language and is rarely put in perspective of history of literary language. And this, in our opinion, is a theoretical “oversight” of stylistics. Indeed, with the correct and logical introduction into a modern scientific paradigm, this term may become the very

У овом чланку дефинише се појам поетске норме као категорије савремене лингвостилистике, историјске стилистике и као стандардне јединице историје песничког језика. Прави се појмовна опозиција „књижевна норма – поетска норма“. Нагласак се ставља на чињеницу да утврђивање временских, просторних и идиостилистичких својстава поетске норме, као и опис типолошких и историјских тенденција које учествују у њеном настанку, омогућују да се покажу њене систематске везе са књижевном нормом и да се у кратким цртама прикаже општа слика стила националне лепе књижевности.

synthesizing notion (in studying temporal, spatial, ethnic, cultural and idiosyncrastic features of literary language), which will claim the status of a standard unit of history of poetics, and, moreover, literary language as “an issue of creative work of a writer as a criteria of literary norm is a part of a broader issue of the role of fiction in development of literary language” (Пилинський 1976: 107). Actually, this can be assumed from the



Koseriu's citation that the norms of literary language are a kind of reduction of the norms, which operate in language of fiction.

The meaning and peculiarity of the main linguistic notions is best revealed in oppositions, which make it possible to differentiate the compared categories according to the criteria that are relevant for researchers. Contemporary linguistic theories and scientific paradigms are based on comparison of *literary language – dialects, literary language – colloquial language, literary language – poetic language*, etc. Distinction of *poetic norm* from *literary norm* is conceptually important to substantiate the categorial status of *poetic norm*.

R. Budagov (Будагов 1967: 40–50), who is one of the first to address the issue, emphasizes that non-identity of these concepts does not mean that they are in direct contradiction, but rather implies inevitable cross-points at a certain chronological stage of the literary language development. In particular, his ultimate postulate asserts an undoubted impact of writers, their individual lingual creativity on the formation of literary language norms as: “on the background of abundant and variable fiction, represented by outstanding writers, literary language becomes more varied, vivid, expressive and emphatic. In this context there is a constant synergy between literary language and language of fiction” (Будагов 1967: 21) The postulate about the influence of writers' individual lingual practices on the formation of literary language norm leads to the conclusion about original, genetic relation between language of fiction and literary language as well as literary norm and stylistic (poetic) one. In modern Ukrainian linguostylistics this postulate remains axiomatic, i.e. “Literary texts are acknowledged as one of the important criteria of literary norm formation at all the temporal stages of literary language develop-

ment” (Єрмоленко 2007: 3). However, the postulate slowly loses its dominant status due to gradual peripherization of fiction with the growing influence of mass-media language.

Budagov's ideas about poetic norm were not being developed as a separate theoretical vector in the 60–70-s of the twentieth century. Only at the end of the 70s this aspect became outlined in the works of N. Mikhailovskaya (*stylistic norm*), V. Grigoriev (*poetic norm, belles-lettres norm, inner norm*), T. Vinokur (*literary language norm*), and Y. Mukarzhovskiyi (*aesthetic norm*). However, this wave of intense interest soon passed into a stage of mechanic and indifferent usage of the notion of *poetic norm* without its extension, update or introduction into novel linguistic paradigms. Meanwhile, thorough development of this notion as a category of modern linguostylistics opens up prospects for simultaneous complex access to several levels of synchronic-diachronic conceptualisation of processes and phenomena that occur in literary discourse and are significant in the context of history of literary language and historical stylistics, as temporal, spatial and idiosyncrastic features of *poetic norm* sustain the thesis of T. Vinokur that the norms of literary language have personalized living key dates.

In the present Ukrainian linguostylistics *a norm* is an active metalinguistic unit of the studies connected with the definition of distributive lingual-aesthetic criteria of word usage, image-building, text creation in the language of poetry and prose of certain literary epochs or trends, socially and culturally significant periods, genres, etc. Freely using this notion to qualify and interpret certain features of a literary text, researchers point to the *norms of poetic lexicon development* (S. Yermolenko, N. Solohub, L. Pustovit), *an aesthetic norm* (S. Yermolenko, L. Stavyt-

ska, H. Syuta, S. Bybyk), a *neologic norm* (H. Vokalchuk), a *phonostylistic text-structuring norm* (H. Syuta, N. Dashchenko), a *syntactic norm* (N. Hujvanyuk), etc. At the same time an emphasis is placed on the fact that the lingual-aesthetic essence of poetic norm appears foreground against certain already formed canons, primarily of linguistic and literary norm: “to explore the lingual-aesthetic phenomenon, it is necessary to contrast it with the others, consider it on the background of similar aesthetic units, correlate with language norm.” (Ставицька 2000: 19). Thus, language norm, is interpreted as an external background to establish, implement and set scientific parameters of poetic norm.

The notion of poetic norm is to be analysed with due consideration of extralingual (specific features of the epoch, cultural priorities, moral values and standards of the society) and intralingual (norms of word usage, level of literary language development) factors placing reliance on idiolect norms. As for the later, H. Vinokur stated that: “in its most creative patterns individual language does not only correspond to its natural prototype of language norm but, moreover, better reveals the characteristics of the norm” (Винокур 1991: 41).

Necessity to give scientific credence to conceptual dichotomy of *poetic norm* – *literary norm* forces researches to define distributive criteria, which will afford ground for not only distinguishing these norms, but also categorizing *poetic norm*. First of all, it is necessary to emphasize the fact that literary and poetic norms are essentially different in their degree of imperativity // permissiveness, socio-cultural relevance and society’s awareness of these norms.

Y. Mukarzhovskiy who considers the ontology of norm emphasizes: “though norm tends to obligation and liability [...], it can never obtain the power of a law, oth-

erwise it would have lost the sense of a norm” (Мукаржовский 1975: 257). Comparing the norms of language and art the researcher illustrates the difference of implementation of literary language norm as a phenomenon of relevant flexibility and art norms (particularly in poetic language as one of genres of art), where they are implemented as the highest possible flexible regulatory principle: “norms exist to be broken” (Мукаржовский 1975: 366). V. Grigoriev develops this idea asserting that “there is an inward similarity in the principles of any art work as for lingual creativity: 1) literary language norms can not but ‘be broken’ if an artist wants to say ‘a new word’, 2) he can not ‘just break’ them all the time otherwise the result would be ‘dyr bul chyl’ or merely linguistic experiments. But the differences in the degree of such ‘breaking’ are real differences which have both qualitative and quantitative characteristics” (Григорьев 1979: 85–86). Here following or breaking an authentic literary norm can be distinguished as one of methodological directions of fiction language investigation: an effective description, which reveals artistic meaningfulness, can be obtained only when each element of the structure of a piece of poetry is evaluated from the point of view of following or breaking a certain system of norms of poetry structure (Y. Lotman).

Unlike the literary one, establishment of poetic norm may also depend on the level of consciousness and cultural experience of:

- an author, e.g. E. Andijewska’s method of saturation the text with dashes to mark semantic pauses, tested in the collection of *Каварня*, has not taken root as an individual norm;
- reader – as he can accept or ignore the ideas suggested by authors, some images or stylistic devices,

e.g. the tendency to colloqualize poetic lexicon and deaestheticize lingual-aesthetic national cultural characters in postmodernists' works has experienced a significant social rejection in Ukraine;

- an interpreter or a researcher – he has to “a) relate a literary work to its closest literary domain and to general national language norm; b) identify its idiosyncratic or inner norm; c) determine deviation from its idiosyncratic or inner norm in the course of narration” (Степанов 1971: 71–75).

Thus, they all act as cocreators of poetic norm. In this process the role of an author and a reader is a creative one, while a researcher investigates and places on record. We can talk about poetic norm actualisation only if the strategies of the participants coincide and interact. For instance, a large number of readers and researchers of futurists' creative pursuit had not accepted their poetry. It led to its peripherization in both linguocultural consciousness of the Ukrainian society and scientific lingual space and, therefore, the relevant material was not properly taken into account when the poetic language development trends of the period were being determined.

*Belles-lettres norm* is another notion that explicates poetic norm as “creative work of any modern poet is perceived against the background of not only current literary language norms, but also the median belles-lettres norms of poetic language of a certain period” (Григорьев 1979: 86). For instance, poetic discourse of the New York group was not immediately adopted in the diaspora because of defiant disinclination to comply with one of the basic postulates of

Artistic Ukrainian Movement (Мистецький Український Рух) to follow the so-called “national organic style” (Y. Shereh). The authors of the New York group deliberately chose the Ukrainian language for their self-creativity but wanted to express themselves having free personal space, without external dogma pressure and objected to the expediency of “writing so that the content of the work emanates the national spirit”. They sought to break stereotypes and clichés of image and text building, to set the point of view on the Ukrainian literature as a nationally specific one, but at the same time, developing in line with contemporary western tendencies. I. Kosteckiy, one of the major diaspora critics and literary scholars, criticized the New York group poets for carelessness in relation to the language, vocabulary, syntax, free stress and “saturnalia metaphors”. Nowadays researchers consider these features original and distinctive, which make it possible to include both the poetic discourse of the New York group poets in general and their separate language portraits in the history of the Ukrainian poetic and literary language.

The mentioned above leads to one more important conclusion: poetic norm is a historical category (hence correlation of *literary language – poetic language* remains symmetrical). Variability or fluctuality of the stylistic norm is caused by the dynamic nature of poetic language itself, historic and social factors, intercultural contacts, general cultural level of society, influence of literary language and colloquial speech, etc. It also varies according to literary traditions, trends, stylistic tendencies, art schools and authors' individual styles (Єрмоленко 1999: 301).

Consequently, variability and stability of PN is defined only regarding poetic language as a system that:

- a) is based on a specific ethnic and cultural tradition,
- b) is actualised in a certain time-spatial manifestation,
- c) is modified within the individual authorial systems.

Indication of *variability* and *stability* of poetic norm is associated with the notions of *tradition* and *innovation* as well as clarification of *temporal* and *spatial* criteria of poetic norm. Thus temporal variability of literary norm can be traced in a text in terms of universal images such as archetypes, symbols, language and aesthetic ethnic culture characters, concepts *Ukraine, motherland, time, land, space, person*, etc., axiological oppositions *one's own – alien, good – evil, truth – lie* etc. Specifying their literary genetics and monitoring their semantic, expressive-evaluative development we come to the conclusion about the variability of lexical-semantic compatibility canons, means of image-creating, ways of text-building both during overall development of poetic language and within the definite period of time when a text was written. A priori it can be asserted that the same images are: a) modelled in a different way, b) used to express different semantics, c) used with different evaluation in the late XIX century, in XX century and at the beginning of the XXI century. In addition, subjective, personal experience of authors, who, in turn, are also “off-springs” of their time, is embedded in historical language models and individual speech patterns which characterize this or that object, phrases with the cultural and historical knowledge. This thesis can be illustrated with an example of the so-called ideological metaphors, particularly, poetic and metaphorical clichés like *Motherland, peoples – brothers, republics – sisters, and the sun of truth*. The contexts which included such clichés were characteristic of unfavourable policy environment and closely connected with ideology as well as time, i.e. the Soviet period and place, i.e. the territory of the Soviet Union, where the poetry was written. Naturally, after socio-political and socio-cultural situation had changed, they not only lost their applicability as text production units, but also obviously transformed their axiological meaning. In this sense, “the way of how and why the composition of traditionally adopted language means has changed is [...] history of poetic language” (Винокур 1991: 389).

The above-mentioned analysis suggests, therefore, that the notion of PN is effectively used to determine the peculiarities of lingual and aesthetic structure of texts at a certain stage of the development of literary style. Recognition of temporal criteria of *poetic norm* as one of its distributive characteristics makes it possible to assign texts to a certain period of time with the help of typical lexical, phraseological and other text-building means. Such time-marked and clearly connected with the epoch images like *Chornobyl* are also ascribed to this group.

Poetic norm variation can be caused by not only historical and social but also spatial and geographic factors. Recognition and setting of *spatial criteria* of poetic norm implies clarification of poetic units functioning peculiarities, usage of phonostylistic, word-building and grammatical means depending on where the poetry was written. This aspect is particularly relevant to the discourse with nominally distinguished diaspora segment. The Ukrainian poetic language of contemporary western diaspora (specifically the above mentioned New York group) was formed in socio-geographic and national and cultural conditions different from those of literary discourse of continental Ukraine. It was a part of the general culture-creating process with an accent on the language as a national

'trademark' and focused on preserving sole Ukrainian lingual mentality space. That is why the analysis of New Yorkers' idiostyles, investigation of their language-creating interstructural processes, studies of text-building types and methods does not only illustrate reliance on national common lingual material and cultural experience (compare a great number of folk poetic and colloquial, everyday cultural, literary and other codes, historical and lingual models in the texts as well as intertextual dialogues with continental poetry) but also proves existence of different types of stylistic transformations of traditional figurative means in idiosystems of V. Vovk (as a traditionalism follower), Y. Tarnavskiy and E. Andijewska (as radical innovators), etc. Consequently, we may state that language creative work of New York group is a separate spatially marked type of the Ukrainian literary discourse, which stylistic norms are superposed onto the structure of national literary and poetic language.

Synthesized analysis of temporal and spatial criteria of poetic norm conceptually leads us to another, *idiostylistic*, level of understanding poetic norm. The notion of *idiostylistic norm* is directly implemented in the system of lingual means and methods of definite sensuous perception of reality. After all, every author lives in a certain time as well as in a certain physical and socio-cultural space, and uses language means to reflect the world through the prism of his personal experience and his national culture. Consequently, literary phenomena, produced by the author are superposed onto "standard categories with which the language policy of the society has enriched the literature of the period" (Винокур 1974: 280)

Synchronized analysis of temporal-spatial poetic norm criteria affords an opportunity to set:

- a) the difference between idiostyles themselves (e.g. ideologically marked metaphor dominated in the official poetic discourse of the sixties, but its axiology got completely different in synchronous poetry of dissidents)
- b) the difference within one idiostyle depending on when and where the poetry was written (e.g. Vira Vovk's early book of poems "Adolescence" shows that the author is attracted by folk trend. She demonstrates maximum reliance on the canons of Ukrainian traditional versification, deep penetration into the elements of the national language, Ukrainian way of lingual thinking and lingual production, while her later works in "Mandala" and "Meander" reveal the author's interest in modern ways of verbiage, though on the basis of ethnically marked stylistic devices, primarily, lexicon and symbols. Similarly, Mykola Rudenko's camp dissident poetry and his "Metaphysical poem", interpreting existential and spiritual issues, the sacred and the profane, etc., are completely different in lexical structure and mental attitude).

Dynamism (variability) of poetic norm presupposes variation on different temporal, spatial and idiostylistic levels, which confirms its mobility, ability to respond to the development of language and poetic consciousness of both an author and a reader. There may be *chronologically commensurate, but idiostylistically marked* variation, e.g. the official poetics and the poetics of dissidents; and *chronologically commensurate and spa-*

tially differentiated variation e.g., the poets of the sixties and the New Yorkers. In this regard, it is necessary to coordinate *temporal*, *spatial* and *idiostylistic* dimensions of poetic norm, as they will not always overlap.

Thorough studies of history of literary language can not but include studies of history of poetic language and poetic norm as one of its standard units which constitutes the most effective types of word usage, lin-

gual-aesthetic transformation, tendencies to word-, image- and text-building, etc.

Specification of temporal, spatial and idiostylistic criteria of poetic norm, interpretation of typological and historical tendencies of its establishment gives an opportunity to demonstrate systematic relationships in the interaction of poetic and literary norms and outline a general picture of the development of national artistic style.

## summary

Σ [ HALYNA M. SYUTA ]

### *Poetic Norm in Categorical System of Contemporary Linguistics*

The concept of poetic norm is one of the main notions in modern linguistics and a standard unit of history of poetic language. With the correct and logical introduction into a modern scientific paradigm, this term may become the very synthesizing notion (in studying temporal, spatial, ethnic, cultural and idiostylistic features of literary language), which will claim the status of a standard unit of history of poetics, and, moreover, literary language. Distinction of *poetic norm* from *literary norm* is conceptually important to substantiate the categorial status of *poetic norm*.

In the present Ukrainian linguistics a *norm* is an active metalinguistic unit of the studies connected with the definition of distributive lingual-aesthetic criteria of word usage, image-building, text creation in the language of poetry and prose of certain literary epochs or trends, socially and culturally significant periods, genres, etc. Freely using this notion to qualify and interpret certain features of a literary text, researchers point to the *norms of poetic lexicon development, an aesthetic norm, a neologic norm, a phonostylistic text-structuring norm, a syntactic norm*. At the same time an emphasis is placed on the fact that the lingual-aesthetic essence of poetic norm appears foreground against certain already formed canons, primarily of linguistic and literary norm. Language norm is interpreted as an external background to establish, implement and set scientific parameters of poetic norm.

The notion of poetic norm is to be analysed with due consideration of extralingual (specific features of the epoch, cultural priorities, moral values of the society) and intralingual (norms of word usage, level of literary language development) factors placing reliance on idiolectic norms.

Poetic norm is a historical category (hence correlation of *literary language – poetic language* remains symmetrical). Variability or its factuality is caused by the dynamic nature of poetic language itself, historic and social factors, intercultural contacts, general cultural level of society, influence of literary language and colloquial speech, etc. It also varies according to literary traditions, trends, stylistic tendencies, art schools and authors' individual styles.

Indication of *variability* and *stability* of poetic norm is associated with the notions of *tradition* and *innovation* as well as clarification of *temporal* and *spatial* criteria of poetic norm. Recognition and setting of *spatial criteria* of poetic norm implies clarification of poetic units functioning peculiarities, usage of phonostylistic, word-building and grammatical means depending on where the poetry was written. This aspect is particularly relevant to the discourse with nominally distinguished diaspora segment.

Thorough studies of history of literary language can not but include studies of history of poetic language and poetic norm as one of its standard units which constitutes the most effective types of word usage, lingual-aesthetic transformation, tendencies to image- and text-building, etc. Specification of temporal, spatial and idiosyncrastic criteria of poetic norm, interpretation of typological and historical tendencies of its establishment gives an opportunity to demonstrate systematic relationships in the interaction of poetic and literary norms and outline a general picture of the development of national artistic style.

208

### Bibliography:

- Будагов 1967: **Будагов, Роман**. Литературные языки и языковые стили. – Москва: Высшая школа. – 367 с.
- Винокур 1991: **Винокур, Григорий**. О языке художественной литературы. – Москва: Высшая школа. – 448 с.
- Винокур 1974: **Винокур, Татьяна К** вопросу о норме в художественной речи. – In: Синтаксис и норма. – Москва: Наука. – С. 267–282.
- Пригорьев 1979: **Пригорьев, Владимир**. Поэтика слова. – Москва: Наука. – 343 с.
- Ермоленко 1999: **Ермоленко, Світлана**. Нариси з української словесності (стилістика та культура мови). – Київ: Довіра. – 431 с.
- Ермоленко 2007: **Ермоленко, Світлана**. Мовно-естетичні знаки культури в історії літературної мови. – In: Мовознавство. – Київ. – № 4–5. – С. 3–12.
- Мукаржовский 1975: **Мукаржовский, Ян**. Эстетическая функция, норма и ценность как социальные факты. – In: Труды по знаковым системам. Кн. 7. – Тарту. – Вып. 365.
- Пилинський 1976: **Пилинський, Микола**. Мовна норма і стиль. – Київ: Наукова думка. – 288 с.
- Ставицька 2000: **Ставицька, Леся**. Естетика слова в українській поезії 10–30-х років ХХ ст. – Київ: Правда Ярославичів. – 156 с.
- Степанов 1971: **Степанов, Юрий**. Семиотика. – Москва: Наука, 1971.