

PERSON IN ARTISTIC DISCOURSE

Describing personal usages that can only be found in fiction or poetry, the author seeks to relate them to general semiotic properties of artistic discourse. He also introduces the notion of pragmatic presupposition reversal in order to explain changes person can undergo in literary texts, this notion throwing new light on the semantic structure of personal deixis.

Key words: person, artistic discourse, presupposition reversal, pronoun, communication situation, speaker, addressee.

The subject matter of this paper is some features peculiar to the category of person as used in artistic discourse (such as fiction and poetry) and not found elsewhere. Prototypically, the category of person is referentially based upon the situation of communication (either oral or written), and within it, upon its nucleus, the act of speaking (or writing). It is with reference to this act (similar in this respect to the point of origin in the system of co-ordinates) that the basic personal subcategories are defined, the 1st person referring to the speaker, the 2nd to the addressee / the person spoken to (occasionally the speaker addressing himself), and the 3rd to something or someone spoken about ¹. Since speaking gives meaning to the whole category of person, the subcategories of the 1st and 2nd person can be regarded, in terms of markedness, as marked ones, their referents explicitly involved in communication activity, whereas the 3rd person is an unmarked one ².

The situation of communication can, of course, be depicted in artistic discourse, with its participants manifested there by means of grammatical and lexical person or other items within the semantic-functional field of personality ³ just as elsewhere. At the same time the conventional and intentional character of artistic semantics, aimed at creating a fictional reality (rather than reflecting some real-world situation) and therefore not analyzable in truth-value terms ⁴, brings about some important consequences concerning the situation of communication within which literary texts are produced, on one hand, and communication situation as represented within the text-internal world of literary work, on the other. Regarding the literary work and the person who produces it, a distinction is drawn between the real author, on the one

¹ On personal categories other than these, see: *Crystal D.* A first dictionary of linguistics and poetics.— London, 1980.— P. 358–359; Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь.— М., 1990.— С. 271–272.

² Cf.: Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика.— М., 1974.— С. 259–266, 285–291.

³ On personality field structure, see: Теория функциональной грамматики. Персональность. Залоговость.— Ленинград, 1991.— С. 5–124.

⁴ *Ingarden R.* O dziele literackim. Badania z pogranicza ontologii, teorii języka i filozofii literatury.— Warszawa, 1988.— S. 179–243, 229; *Ulicka D.* Granice literatury i pogranicza literaturoznawstwa : Fenomenologia Romana Ingardena w świetle filozofii lingwistycznej.— Warszawa, 1999.— Passim; cf.: *Лангер С.* Философия в новом ключе.— М., 2000.— С. 232–235.

hand, and the literary, or text-internal, subject, on the other⁵. The literary subject is the author's counterpart, or alter ego, inhering in the fictional world created by the author and expressed by his work's text, and so, like this text and text-internal world, it is basically the product of the author's artistic imagination, no matter how realistic his portrayal can be⁶.

But the text-internal subject differs from the author in relation to locutionary activity as well. On the one hand, as the Polish philologist J. Sławiński points out, quoting J. Kleiner, every literary text is perceived as someone's utterance so that the perception is accompanied by the feeling that there is also a speaking subject (*podmiot mówiący*). Because of that, «literary utterance in its entirety is always found between quotation marks and can be interpreted as a citation of what is said by the subject inhering in it alone and nowhere else». But saying that this is true of lyrical poetry irrespective of its particular character (such as egocentric confession, poetic address, or landscape description), he, however, adds that these lyrical varieties differ in the degree of speech process explicitness⁷. It appears that their differing in this respect is correlated with, and determined by, how explicitly they represent the literary subject, the latter difference underlying the opposition between so called direct genres of lyrical poetry (those with the literary subject expressed in the 1st person) and (seemingly impersonal) mediate ones⁸. Oscillation in the degree of the literary subject's locutionary manifestation can occur within the same text, cf. M. Yu. Lotman's observation on the author's narration in «Евгений Онегин» by A. S. Pushkin: «There is also a structural interplay... between different levels of narration: at one of them, narration is so merged with what it tells about that it becomes entirely neutral, inconspicuous, and as if transparent, whereas at the opposite level, narration tells about itself, becoming entirely autonomous and conscious of itself»⁹.

Arguably, the possibility of this oscillation originates in the nature of the subject of enunciation as expressed, grammatically and / or otherwise, in the content of any utterance. Contrary to what R. Barthes said, applying some thoughts of É. Benveniste to the problem of author's non-existence («...linguistics furnishes the destruction of the Author with a precious analytic instrument, showing that the speech-act in its entirety is an "empty" process, which functions perfectly without it being necessary to "fill" it with the person of the interlocutors: linguistically, the author is nothing but the one who writes, just as *I* is nothing but the one who says *I*: language knows a "subject", not a "person", and this subject, empty outside of the very speech-act which defines it, suffices to "hold" language, i. e. to exhaust it»¹⁰), this nature of enunciation subject seen as «the aggregate of the self»¹¹ appears to be far more complex as it includes,

⁵ Sławiński J. Podmiot literacki // Głowiński M., Kostkiewiczowa T., Okopień-Sławińska A., Sławiński J. Słownik terminów literackich.— Wrocław etc., 1976.— S. 310; Okopień-Sławińska A. Semantyka wypowiedzi poetyckiej. Preliminaria.— Kraków, 2001.— Passim.

⁶ The Polish author Jan Parandowski in the introduction to the post-war edition of his novel «Niebo w płomieniach» pointed out that prose, unlike poetry, tends to hide rather than display its author.

⁷ Sławiński J. Dzieło. Język. Tradycja.— Warszawa, 1974.— S. 81–86.

⁸ On these genres, see: Sławiński J. Liryka // Głowiński M., Kostkiewiczowa T., Okopień-Sławińska A., Sławiński J. Op. cit.— S. 215.

⁹ Лотман Ю. М. В школе поэтического слова: Пушкин, Лермонтов, Гоголь.— М., 1988.— С. 156.

¹⁰ Barthes R. P. The death of the Author // Barthes R. The rustle of language / Transl. by R. Howard.— Berkeley etc., 1989.— P. 51; cf.: Бенвенист Э. Op. cit.— С. 286–287. However, given Benveniste's view on subjectivity of language, it is open to question whether he would have subscribed to Barthes' ideas.

¹¹ See: Cuddon J. A. A dictionary of literary terms and literary theory.— Chichester, 2013.— P. 690.

besides its primary role of speaker, the role of the subject of mental activities (such as perception) as well, these secondary roles also expressed, although not necessarily directly, in discourse¹². In other words, the prototypical speaker is presupposed to be, among other things, the observer as well.

And this is what permits literary subject to oscillate between two alternative manifestations, locutionary and perceptual. In the first case, it reproduces some genre, either oral or written, of non-artistic speech, whereas in the second, even the basic oral / written distinction becomes irrelevant in that the literary subject's manifestation backgrounds speech as well as speech activity, putting sensory perception in the foreground instead (which, incidentally, shows that M. M. Bakhtin's claim about every literary genre deriving from some non-artistic speech genre¹³ cannot be accepted, at least not without some very serious reservations).

Consequently, it is in texts with the perceptual literary subject that deviant usage of person and personality can be expected to occur. For instance, in descriptive lyrical poetry lacking the 1st and 2nd person, the literary subject can be represented predominantly or even exclusively as observer rather than speaker, i. e. the one through whose eyes the reader perceives the work's inner world, as in the following poem by Ivan Bunin (an author for whom this kind of lyrical discourse was highly characteristic): «Желтые ржи, далеко озаренные, / Морем безбрежным стоят... / Ветер повет — они, полусонные, / Колосом спелым шуршат. / ..Зыблется пепельный сумрак над нивами, / А над далекой межой / Свет из-за тучек бежит переливами — / Яркою, желтой волной». However, this subtle yet very essential difference in the nature of literary subject is inconspicuous due to the absence of grammatical and lexical person markers referring to the latter. The feature «perceptual subject» is implicitly realized through the whole text's content, which neutralizes the feature «speaker» otherwise assigned to the 1st person and its referent, indicating instead that the text-internal situation in which the literary subject is found doesn't imply any speech activity. Thus, paradoxically, no matter what literary subject is, speaker or speechless observer, the author has no means other than linguistic to depict this artistic alter ego of his.

But the speaker perceives not only the situation he faces (or what J. Kuryłowicz termed *consituation*) but himself as well, in particular, engaging in some other outer activity than observation. Some of these activities make the possibility of speaker coincidentally telling about them highly unlikely, and some make it physically impossible. For instance, one can't normally speak while sleeping or keeping silence, or singing, or snorkeling, and the number of situation when one is doing something and at the same time is telling about it (as on TV cooking programs) is fairly limited. Yet for artistic language with its intentionality and literary conventions, the 1st person representation of text-internal subject in these circumstances is both possible and perfectly normal. Consider the following examples where the literary subject is alone, with no possible addressee present around: «Auf einmal sind die Seiten überschienen / und statt der bangen Wortverworrenheit / steht: Abend, Abend... überall auf ihnen. Ich schau noch nicht hinaus, und doch zerreißen / die langen Zeilen, und die Worte rollen / von ihren Fäden fort, wohin sie wollen... / Da weiß ich es: über den überwollen / glänzenden Gärten sind die Himmel weit...» (R. M. Rilke); «Десять чорних кімнат, налитих п'ютьмою по самі вінця. Вони облягають мою кімнату. Я зачиняю двері, наче боюся, що світло лампи витече все крізь щпарі. От я і сам. Навкруги ні

¹² Падучева Е. В. Говорящий: субъект речи и субъект сознания // Логический анализ языка. Культурные концепты.— М., 1991.— С. 164–168.

¹³ Бахтин М. М. Эстетика художественного творчества.— М., 1979.— С. 279.

душі. Тихо й безлюдно, а однак я щось там чую, поза своєю спиною. Воно мені заважає» (М. Коцюбинський); or asleep: «Сон м'яко здушує груди, кладе на лице лапу і тягне назад у ліжко. Сплю. Солодко, міцно і навіть сон бачу. Раптом зскакую з ліжка і з переляком дивлюсь на годинник: проспав дві хвилини» (М. Коцюбинський); or just manifestly silent: «Звон вечерней гудит, уносясь / в вышину. Я молчу, я доволен. / Светозарные волны, искрясь, / зажигают кресты колоколен» (А. Белый); «Молчу, потерянный, на дальний путь глядя, / Из-за темнеющего сада» (А. Фет); or otherwise depicted within the situation making speech hardly, if at all, possible: «Гей, іду я полем з піснено-журбою» (П. Тичина); «Іду вперед./Десь там — за мною захід. / Сухотно-жовту головошку на села кинув — жде... (П. Тичина); «И громом, и пеной пучинная сила, / холодная, бурно меня охватила, / кружит, и бросает, и душит, и бьет, / И стихла. Мне любо. Из грома, из пены / И холода — легок и свеж выхожу» (М. Языков); «Что, все ли улеглись, уснули? Не пора ль?.. / На сердце жар любви, и трепет, и печаль!.. / Бегу! Далекое, как бы в вознагражденье, / Шлют звезды в инее свое изображение. / ...Под быстрою стопой промерзлая земля / Звучит. Бегу! Нигде огня — соседи полегли» (А. Фет); «Стучу, стучу я молотком, / Верчу, верчу трубу на ломе / И отговаривается гром / И в воздухе, и в каждом доме. / Кусаю ножницами я / Железа жесткую краюшку / И ловит подо мной струя / За стружкой другую стружку» (В. Казин).

In cases like these, the feature «speaker» associated with the 1st person as its primary meaning loses its immediate relevance, being neutralized under the influence of context. At the same time, it isn't suppressed altogether since it is moved to another, deeper level of the 1st person semantic structure, where it operates as the inner form motivating the expression of the feature «observer», which it normally presumes. In other words, the 1st person used in such a way denotes observer as if he were speaker. Thus, what happens there can be termed presupposition reversal: a semantic feature which generally presupposes another one here gets expressed by it instead. Since the presupposition involved in this process of reversal refers to the subject of enunciation and one of his roles in communication, it should be labeled pragmatic.

In such context, the 2nd person can co-occur with the 1st: «Яблука доспіли, яблука червоні! / Ми йдемо з тобою стежкою в саду» (М. Рильський, с. 79); «Jak się te lata myła! / Ej, biegną jak konie kare. / I znów idę z tobą nad Wilią / zieleniejącym bulwarem./ Wiosna przegląda się w wodzie / niczym ty w lustrze weneckim» (K. I. Gałczyński). This kind of addressing interlocutor (telling him about something he can't help noticing himself) not only contradicts Grice's Cooperative Principle (specifically, Maxim of Quantity¹⁴), but also is unparalleled outside artistic language, where Gricean principles and maxims are more often than not violated¹⁵.

A similar presupposition reversal also takes place within the framework of the figure of personification (understood as poetic metaphor representing animals, plants, artifacts, nature phenomena, and abstract notions as human beings capable of speaking and acting in human way¹⁶) where such object is identified with lyrical subject and correspondingly referred to in the 1st person, cf.: «Я — цинкова форма. А зміст в

¹⁴ *Грайс Г. П.* Логика и речевое общение // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике.— М., 1985.— Вып. 16.— С. 222.

¹⁵ As A. Okopień-Sławińska observed, both everyday and artistic language are not regulated by Gricean maxims, although for different reasons (see: *Okopień-Sławińska A.* Op. cit.— S. 240).

¹⁶ Personification in this sense is to be distinguished from anthropomorphism, a trope ascribing some human features to non-human entities, see: *Okopień-Sławińska A.* Personifikacja // *Głowiński M., Kostkiewiczowa T., Okopień-Sławińska A., Sławiński J.* Op. cit.— Wrocław etc., 1976.— S. 299–300, where these two notions are differentiated, stating in the same time that the boundary between the two can be vague and elusive.

мені — вишні, / Терново-огненні запилені кулі.. / Я — цинкова форма. А зміст в мені — груші.. / Я — цинкова форма. А зміст не від мене, / Підвладне я часу, підвладне потребам...» (І. Драч); «Pile the bodies high at Austerlitz and Waterloo. / Shovel them under and let me work — / I am the grass. I cover all. /... Let me work» (C. Sandburg). In the second example, where the personified entity (the grass) is represented as a speaking and acting person, pragmatic presupposition reversal involves another features of the prototypical speaker: such a speaker is presumed to be human and able to speak. Correspondingly, the 1st person represents the grass as capable of human behavior, including speech.

Moving on from the 1st to 2nd person as used in artistic discourse, it should be noted at once that while the artistic kinds of 1st person use discussed above mostly occur both in prose and poetry, 2nd person uses associated with artistic discourse are for the most part poetical. The distinction between real-world and text-internal, or fictional, communication situation applies to them as well, taking the form of the opposition between the actual and literary (text-internal, fictional) addressee. That is not to say, however, that such an addressee doesn't occur outside poetry, cf., for instance, Bunin's story «Неизвестный друг» consisting of a series of letters sent to the author by his reader, or instances of the text-internal narrator addressing his fictional listeners. There are also some prose forms having the 2nd person as their constitutive feature, such as epistolary novel or travel book consisting of letters (cf. «Lettres portugaises» by J.-G. Guilleraques, «Lettres a l'inconnue» by A. Maurois or «Письма русского путешественника» by N. M. Karamzin). However, these are all cases of literary genres deriving from, and so reproducing, non-artistic speech genres, so that the 2nd person is used here essentially as elsewhere. The same is true of those poems where both the lyrical subject and its addressee participate in text-internal communication (which sometimes reflects an actual situation with the author addressing somebody). Yet there are also cases of specifically artistic use of the 2nd person in prose, which will be discussed later.

It should also be pointed out that the 2nd person is a constitutive feature of the well-known rhetorical figure of apostrophe, characteristic, in particular, of elevated style and lofty as well as markedly literary language, for instance, of the poetical genre of ode¹⁷, e. g. «Thou still unravish'd bride of quietness! / Thou foster child of Silence and slow Time» (J. Keats). In apostrophe, a thing, a place, an abstract quality, an idea, a dead or absent person, is addressed as if present and capable of understanding¹⁸, cf. the words of Apostle Paul echoing Prophet Osee addressing death (Osee 13, 14): «πῶς σου, θάνατε, τὸ νῆκος!» (1 Ad Corinthios, 15, 55).

However, there is a far less known kind of poetical use of the 2nd person, altogether unusual for everyday language and at the same time different from apostrophe, cf. the following poem by M. Ryl's'kuj: «Сніг падав безшелесно й рівно, / Туманно танули вогні, / І дальній дзвін стояв так дивно / В незрозумілій тишині. / Ми вдвох ішли й не говорили, / Ти вся засніжена була, / Сніжинки грали і зорили / Над смутком тихого чола. / І люди млисто пропливали, / Щезали й гасли, як у сні, — / І ми ішли й мети не знали / В вечірній сніжній тишині». In this text an event is depicted as recollected, and previously witnessed, by the lyrical subject, yet there are no indications other than the 2nd person that he is actually speaking to «her» or anybody else. The addressee is only represented as

¹⁷ Okopień-Sławińska A. Apostrofa // Głowiński M., Kostkiewiczowa T., Okopień-Sławińska A., Sławiński J. Op. cit.— S. 30.

¹⁸ Cuddon J. A. A dictionary of literary terms and literary theory.— Chichester, 2013.— P. 49.

participating in this event; or better to say, the other protagonist of the lyrical situation is portrayed here as if she is being addressed by the poetical subject. Inanimate objects, too, can be pictured in the same vein: «Над чернотой твоих пучин / Горели дивные светила, / И тяжко зыбь твоя ходила / Взрывая огонь беззвучных мин. / [...] И снова, шумен и глубок, / Ты восставал и загорался» (И. Бунин). Past events depicted in this way can also be imagined rather than witnessed by the lyrical subject, as in Bunin's poem «Шестикрылый» (telling about the picture of a seraph in an old church): «Алел ты в зареве Батыя — / И потемнел твой жуткий взор. / Ты крылья рыже-золотые / В священном трепете простер. / Узрел ты Грозного-юрода / Монашеский истертый шлык — / И навсегда в изгибах свода / Застыл твой большеглазый лик».

Thus, unlike these, apostrophe puts emphasis on the literary subject's speaking, his locutionary role also manifested, beside the 2nd person, by rhetorical questions and vocatives or their equivalents (cf.: «Oh Nemo where's your dream tonight? I used to dream of you when I was ten» — R. Bradbury), and also by such biblionyms (names of poems) that suggest the lyrical subject's communicative activity (cf. Ryl's'kyj's «Лист до загубленої адресатки» or «Лист до волошки») whereas its addressees are more or less unusual. On the other hand, the 2nd person can, as was shown, also be used in poetical texts of descriptive character, vividly picturing scenes and events witnessed or imagined by the lyrical subject, with the 2nd person's referent taking part in them (of course, one can find borderline cases as well). Arguably, it is the 2nd person that is instrumental in achieving such a graphical effect, and a semantic process producing it involves, similar to the «perceptual» use of the 1st person, the reversal of personal presuppositions¹⁹. Pragmatic presupposition features associated with the 2nd person seem to be more numerous than those of the 1st person since they concern the former's referent as well as the latter's, and also the relation between the two. It is quite obvious that the prototypical 2nd person referent should be human and capable at least of understanding speech. Being addressed in the 2nd person also indicates there is a speaker with all of his/her presumed qualities. Lastly, the situation the addressor and the addressee are both found in must provide for their successful communication, and that means that they should be perceptually accessible to each other in terms of space and time as well as social hierarchy: interlocutors are supposed to be able to hear and, coincidentally, see each other, and therefore they should be within perceptual distance of each other, and, of course, possess necessary faculties; besides, the addressee should be socially achievable to the addressor. Outside its usual context and consituation, with its presuppositions not fulfilled, the 2nd person can instead turn into a means of expression of otherwise presumed semantic features, ascribing them to the fictional addressee, either unusual, or absent, or both, the latter's character determining which particular presuppositions are to be reversed into semantic features implicitly expressed rather than presupposed. Such reversal takes place both in apostrophe and in the «descriptive» use of the 2nd person, with different features involved: in the former the fictional addressee is represented as actually, if unconventionally from everyday language's viewpoint, spoken to, whereas in the latter, the aim of the use of the 2nd person is to represent its referent as if *hic et nunc*, i. e. present at the moment and place of speaking, and, through the identification of the situation of communication and the described situation in which the 2nd person referent participates, to make them both, the situation as well as the referent, perceptually close

¹⁹ Ермоленко С. Обернення особових пресупозицій як явище художнього мовлення // Стил.— 2004.— № 3.— С. 327–338.

and therefore — for the reader — easily imaginable²⁰. Of course this descriptive use of the 2nd person, like the «perceptual» 1st person, is a poetic convention, although not as conspicuous or unusual as apostrophe, possibly due to a Natural Grammar rule of markedness reversal, according to which a marked linguistic unit (here, descriptive 2nd person) loses its markedness when occurring within marked context (here, poetic and, more generally, artistic discourse)²¹.

The descriptive use of the 2nd person in love poetry has a peculiar consequence for the meaning of the 2nd person pronoun, such as Ukrainian *ти* or English *you*, referring to the lyrical subject's beloved. Love poetry, as defined by V. Nabokov, is poetry «about, for, and to *her*»²², so it is quite natural that in poems addressing «her» «she» is replaced by «you». Yet the same can occur, as was shown, in poems telling about «her» as well, with the corresponding pronoun «you» becoming a poetic name of a beloved. Strictly speaking, even if «you» is used in love poetry as in everyday language, in particular, referring to a real person whom the author actually addresses, there is still a significant difference in what it means for the author and his addressee, on one hand, and the general public, on the other: for the former, it is a substitute for addressee's real name, whereas for the latter, it is her/his only name known to it, the only name it know her/him under²³. Thus it is but natural that under such circumstances the pronoun becomes something not unlike an appellative substantive, absorbing semantic features associated with its prototypical artistic referent as represented in the love poetry of a given author, period, school, or style, so that its meaning is determined intertextually as well as contextually. That poets themselves are cognizant of this is demonstrated by the observation B. Pasternak made in his review of A. Axmatova's book of verse: «Axmatova contraposed the voice of feeling in the meaning of real intrigue to erotic abstraction which in most poetic effusions the conventional live “you” tends to degenerate into... It gave completely new dramatic character and prose narrative's freshness to “Вечер” and “Четки”, her first collections»²⁴.

This change from pronoun to noun is paralleled by the 3rd person pronouns «he» and, especially, «she» used in artistic texts, poetic as well as prosaic, as the beloved's only designation, cf. Dante Gabriel Rossetti's «Without her» (where the reference to «her» in the 3rd person, contrasted with the 2nd person referring only to the lyrical subject's heart emphasizes his loss): «What of her glass without her? The blank grey / There where the pool is blind of the moon's face. / Her dress without her? The tossed empty space / Of cloud-rack whence the moon has passed away. / Her paths without her?»; or Ye. Baratynskij's lines: «Скорбя душою, / В тоске моей, / Склонюсь главою / На сердце к ней, И под мятежной / Метелью бед, Любовью нежной / Ее согрет, Забуду вскоре / Крутое горе». Whatever personal reasons these authors had

²⁰ As far as I know, I. I. Kovtunova was the first to identify this variant of the 2nd person in Russian poetry (see: *Ковтунова И. И. Поэтический синтаксис.*— М., 1986.— С. 89–104), yet she qualified it simply as «communicative metaphor» consisting in substituting the 2nd person for the 3rd in order to make the latter's referent closer to the speaker. Also, she seems not to distinguish it from the 2nd person found in apostrophe.

²¹ *Ермоленко С. С. Проблемы семиотического подхода к изучению грамматического строя языка // Методологические основы новых направлений в мировом языкознании.*— К., 1992.— С. 317.

²² *Набоков В. В. Другие берега.*— М., 1991.— С. 146.

²³ *Łotman J. Tekst i struktura audytorium // Pamiętnik Literacki.*— 1991.— Т. 82.— Zesz. 1.— S. 237.

²⁴ *Пастернак Б. Л. «Избранное» Анны Ахматовой // Борис Пастернак об искусстве.*— М., 1990.— С. 157–158.

for not calling «her» by her own name, for the general public this pronoun becomes «her» only designation which has absorbed everything the text of the poem tells about her, on one hand, as well as some other features present in what M. Bakhtin called the genre's memory, on the other.

Poets seem to be aware of this special character of «she» used in poetry too, as witnessed by the Nabokov's definition of love poetry, and also by T. Boy-Żeleński's ironical poem about girl the heroine of Polish poetry: «To królestwo samowładne / Legendarnej polskiej panny. / Dla Niej, dla tej jasnej wróżki, / Nasi geniusze się trują... / Prez Nią, za Nią, dla Niej, od Niej / Wszystko bierze swój początek». In Ye. Yevtushenko's poem «Братская ГЭС» one of its characters, a worker and also an amator poet, speaks about his fictional beloved in his kitschy piece much in the same way: «Забудьте меня, родственники, дети! / Забудь меня, ворчащая жена! / Я молодой! Уйду я на рассвете / туда, где ждет лучистая ОНА. / И я ее лобзать на травах буду / и ей сплетать из орхидей венки, / и станут о любви трубить повсюду / герольды наши — майские жуки» (in the last two examples, capital letters seem to signal awe and respect rather than unique reference, as in proper names).

In prose, the use of the Russian pronouns *он* and *она* as appellative substantives (based on their sex reference) was observed by E. Greber in A. Chexov's story «Он и она» where they denote otherwise nameless characters²⁵. One may also mention here the metatextual use of these pronouns in another Baratynskij's poem where they introduce fragments of «his» and «her» speech (cf. also in Pushkin's «Цветок»: «И жив ли тот? И та жива ли? И нынче где их уолок?»).

Also, the substantive meaning of the pronoun «she», in particular «beloved one», is registered in some dictionaries, such as Oxford dictionary of the English language (*she* IV. As noun. 7a. «a female; a woman or girl; a lady-love» «...The domino began to make very fervent love to the she». — Fielding)²⁶ or Словник української мови в 11 т. (*вона* «...у значенні іменника. Означає особу жіночої статі як об'єкт чийого-небудь кохання»²⁷, cf. its occurrence in the lyrical prose of O. Dovzhenko: «Ідеш отак у доброму косарським товаристві і бачиш, ідучи, й вечірне небо, і ясну зорю, і її з грабельками на округлому дівочому плечі»).

Returning to the grammatical 2nd person, it should be pointed out once more that it is not uncommon in the narrator's speech, whereas instances where the narrator addresses his protagonist in the 2nd person are rare indeed. To be sure, the latter should be distinguished from the 2nd person referring to reader(s) or fictional listener(s), or being used in the generalized meaning (cf. «Записки охотника» by I. Turgenev, «Севастопольские рассказы» by L. Tolstoy, or «Мисливські оповіді» by O. Vyshnia. As different from the narrative 2nd person, these uses are not of strictly artistic nature, having their common language counterparts which they reproduce. On the other hand, the narrative in the 2nd person is difficult to motivate, one of possible motivations being the narrator addressing «a younger version of their self». Commenting one of the few examples of such prose, the novel «La modification» (1957) by M. Butor (where the main character is consistently, and also politely, referred to in the 2nd person plural²⁸ throughout the whole text), the scholars of the so

²⁵ Greber E. Mythos — Name — Pronomen. Der literarische Werktitel als metatextueller Indikator // Wiener Slawistischer Almanach.— 1992.— Bd. 30.— S. 110.

²⁶ Oxford English Dictionary Second Edition on CD-ROM (v. 4.0).— Oxford, 2009.

²⁷ Словник української мови : В 11 т.— К., 1970.— Т. 1.— С. 127.

²⁸ In the Ukrainian translation (*Бютор М. Переміна* / Пер. з фр. Г. Малєнь.— К., 2003) the 2nd person plural is rendered by the singular, the change in the number highlighting the difference in this, seemingly similar, mode of address in French and Ukrainian.

called μ -group maintained that while describing «him» on his journey, the author refers to him as «you» as if to be left alone with the protagonist to speak to him in private and have the annoying reader excluded from communication²⁹.

On the other hand, Butor himself wrote in his essay «Répertoire II» that the author's narrative in the 2nd person is a means of disclosing the recreated consciousness which is being constantly in the state of flux during the process of reading; hence, it is also a means of creating a corresponding language: the 2nd person refers here to someone who is being told his own history which he doesn't yet know (at least, at the level of language), therefore the function of the narrative in this person may be called didactic³⁰. Be it as it may (the two interpretations don't seem to be mutually exclusive), I would like to draw attention to yet another example of the 2nd person narrative, the one found in Ostap Vyshnia's short story «Дрохва» (1946). Prior in time and far shorter than Butor's work, this humorous hunting story, one of Vyshnia's famous «Мисливські усмішки», is a piece of experimental prose no less interesting than that by Butor, although far less known. In Vyshnia's other hunting stories, the narrator instructs would-be hunters and / or shares his experience with them, using the 2nd person plural in the «impersonating» meaning typical of everyday language: «Словом, ви поїхали на лугові озера, на очерети й на тихі-тихі плеса. Само собою розуміється, що ви берете з собою рушницю... Їдете ви компанією». However, in this story he employs the 2nd person plural imperative in a way that combines both these communicative goals, that of experience sharing and that of instruction, so that the reader is identified by the narrator with him and transported in the situation from the latter's childhood where he is told what to do in order to recreate this situation once more: «Як підете ви з хутора на гору, отуди, де колись стояв млин-вітряк, а потім звернете на межу поміж пшеницями та спустить тою межею трохи ніби в діл — на шлях, що простягся з хутора В'язового до церкви, що в ній на Покрову храм бував, так ви собі і йдіть тим шляхом далі. Минете церкву, потім Куликами, Куликами (це куток на селі, де всі Кулики живуть) аж за містечко вийдете. Вийшли ви за містечко і прямуйте далі... Минете Халдеївщину, а там уже швидко й Дуб'яги будуть». If the «impersonating» 2nd person, widely used in everyday and artistic discourse, imparts the narrator's viewpoint to the addressee by replacing the 1st person³¹, Vyshnia seeks to freshen up this traditional grammatical metaphor by making it literal and explicit through manipulating his addressee: «Од вашого хутора до Дуб'ягів буде не більше, мабуть, як кілометрів із вісім. Щоб не сумно вам було йти, ви б могли проказувати, ідучи межею поміж пшеницями: "По ниве прохожу я узкою межею, поросшей кашкою и цепкой лебедой!" Та ви ж не вмієте ще такого проказувати, бо вам іще тільки сім років... Проказувати таке ви вмітимете тільки через два роки... А як іще сумно вам, тоді ловіть на колосках жучка-кузьку. Вловили — й за пазуху... Вам не сумно тоді, і ви, підстрибуючи, аж на Дуб'ягах опинитесь!.. Приходите, у садку за столом куркулі два сидять та горілку з глечика п'ють».

Summing up this survey of person used in artistic discourse, I'd like to emphasize several points. Firstly, person used artistically is both *sui generis* and derivative of its

²⁹ Общая риторика / Дюбуа Ж., Эделин Ф., Клинкаберг Ж.-М., Мэнге Ф., Пир Ф., Тринон А. / Пер. с фр.— М., 1986.— С. 289.

³⁰ Butor M. *Użycie zaimków osobowych w powieści* // *Pamiętnik Literacki*.— 1970.— Т. 61.— Zesz. 3.— S. 241–250.

³¹ Єрмоленко С. С. Мовне моделювання дійсності і знакова структура мовних одиниць.— К., 2006.— С. 217–227.

everyday use. Secondly, in order to adequately describe the semantics of person (actually, any other semantic category as well), one should take into account the nature and essential properties of every important kind of discourse it occurs in. Thirdly, taking into consideration the way person is used artistically can throw new light on its prototypical semantic structure and on the linguistic image of speaker, addressee and communication situation.

С. С. ЄРМОЛЕНКО

КАТЕГОРІЯ ОСОБИ В ХУДОЖНЬОМУ ДИСКУРСІ

Автор статті, описуючи випадки вживання категорії особи, що спостерігаються лише у прозі й поезії, прагне витлумачити їх у світлі загальних семіотичних властивостей художнього дискурсу. Він також уводить поняття обернення прагматичних пресупозицій з метою дати пояснення семантичній еволюції, якої категорія особи може зазнавати в літературних текстах. Застосування цього поняття дозволяє також по-новому поглянути на семантичну структуру особового дейксису.

Ключові слова: особа, художній дискурс, обернення пресупозицій, займенник, ситуація спілкування, мовець, адресат.