

TO A PROBLEM OF LINGUISTIC RESEARCH OF SYMBOLS IN RUSSIAN SYMBOLISTS' POETRY

Syromlia N. M., Krasniuk S. O.

INTRODUCTION

Symbolism, as A. Losev writes, “differed from artistic realism not by the use of a symbol (these symbols are no less used in any realism), but by purely ideological features <...> The symbolists wanted to understand how real that is supernatural, supersensible, preternatural or at least a philosophical construction”¹.

In the studies of culturologists, special attention is paid to the role of Russian symbolism, which should be assessed in a new quality – as a trend that stood at the origins of domestic culturology of the 20th century, as a direction that gave impetus to its further development².

Scientists write about the serious impact of ideas of V. Ivanov and P. Florensky on A. Losev, whose theory of a symbol acts as the foundation of ontology and culturology, is an experience of philosophical symbolism, the purpose of which is to explore various spheres of the existence of a symbol, and the main ones are language, myth, religion and art³.

The emergence of symbolism is associated with the work of French poets of the 1870's, who sought to “expand the framework of perception” of the surrounding world: “The imagination of the creator does not care about the accepted rules, legalized models <...>, authorities”⁴. For French symbolism, in contrast to the later formed Russian and German, artistic principles were important above all.

Researchers note the special role of the development of the ideas of symbolism in Russia and Germany for the further development of modernism in Europe. Let's dwell on Russian symbolism.

¹ Лосев А. Проблема символа и реалистическое искусство. Москва, 1976. С. 190, 164.

² Асоян Ю., Малафеев А. Открытие идеи культуры (Опыт русской культурологии середины XIX – начала XX в.). Москва : ОГИ, 2001. С. 273.

³ Асоян Ю., Малафеев А. Открытие идеи культуры (Опыт русской культурологии середины XIX – начала XX в.). Москва : ОГИ, 2001. С. 277.

⁴ Энциклопедия символизма. Живопись, графика и скульптура. Литература. Музыка. Москва : Республика, 1999. С. 6.

1. Features of the understanding of the category of symbol by Russian symbolist poets

It is customary to characterize Russian symbolists according to chronological, geographical and ideological characteristics. Thus, there are “senior” (1890’s) and “younger” (1900’s) ones; authors of St. Petersburg and Moscow; writers of individualistic orientation – “decadents” and the followers of V. Solovyov and his doctrine of “total unity”⁵.

S. Timina notes that symbolism in Russia had roots in domestic culture: in 1884 an attempt was made in Kiev to create a pre-modernist society “New Romantics” (representatives – Nikolai Minsky and Jerome Yasinsky)⁶.

Many researchers in one way or another turn to the artistic experience of Russian symbolists: M. Bakhtin analyzes the work of Vyach. Ivanov, M. Lotman investigated the works of A. Bely, A. Blok⁷.

Yu. Stepanov calls the teaching of the symbolists the initial stage in the conceptual evolution of the New Age, since in the context of symbolism, a symbol is a concept, an idealized representation of what we now call a concept⁸. This point of view reflects the most recent view of a symbol category within the framework of the poetics of Russian symbolism.

N. Kozhevnikova writes about the individual understanding of the symbol by each poet: the symbol “for Bryusov is an allegory, for Bely A. – “an idea-image”, for Vyach. Ivanov – a sign, the meaning of which is revealed in a myth”⁹. The author rightly notes the peculiarities of the role of a myth and the associative field of a symbol: “Symbolists construct the text in such a way as to direct possible associations in a certain direction. This is served by an indication of a certain myth, explicitly or implicitly present in the text”¹⁰.

According to Z. Mints, the peculiarity of a semantic structure of a symbol among the Russian symbolists is as follows: “naming the phenomenon of the earthly, “terrestrial”, a symbol simultaneously “marks” everything that “corresponds” to it in the “other worlds”, and so as the

⁵ Минералова И. Русская литература серебряного века : Поэтика символизма. Москва : Флинта ; Наука, 2003. С. 9.

⁶ Русская литература XX в. : Школы, направления, методы творческой работы. Санкт-Петербург : Logos ; Москва : Высшая школа, 2002. С. 16–17.

⁷ Свенцицкая Э. Концепции слова и младшие символисты : монография. Донецк : ДонНУ, 2005. С. 7.

⁸ Степанов Ю. Протей : Очерки хаотической эволюции. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2004. С. 67.

⁹ Кожевникова Н. Словоупотребление в русской поэзии начала XX в. Москва : Наука, 1986. С. 14.

¹⁰ Кожевникова Н. Словоупотребление в русской поэзии начала XX в. Москва : Наука, 1986. С. 14.

worlds are endless, then the meanings of the symbol for a symbolist are endless”¹¹.

So, A. Bely understands a symbol as a “window into Eternity”, which connects “the eternal with its spatial and temporal manifestations”. “A characteristic feature of symbolism in art”, the poet writes, “is the desire to use the image of reality as a means of conveying the experienced content of consciousness. An image, as a model of the experienced content of consciousness, is a symbol”¹².

N. Molchanova gives the definition of K. Balmont’s symbolic poetry: “I call symbolic poetry that kind of poetry where, in addition to concrete content, there is also hidden content, organically connected with it and intertwined with the most delicate threads” and, commenting on it, writes that for the poet’s “hidden content” is the second plan of a symbolic image, but by no means “ideological, abstract content”¹³. The author emphasizes that on the poetic language, “threads” are metaphor, associativity, hints, rhythmic, melodic and other means of expression. So, the analysis of the symbolic meanings of the element of earth in the lyrics of K. Balmont showed an explication of traditional and author’s semantics¹⁴.

In N. Kozhevnikova’s works, it is said about the heterogeneity of symbols in the poetry of the early twentieth century: “Some of the symbols are based on wide cultural traditions. They are, as it were, introduced into a literary work from the outside, with a characteristic meaning for them that one needs to know. Some of the symbols arise on the basis of those semantic relationships that develop within a work or a whole series of them”¹⁵.

Hansen-Loewe A. substantiates the originality of interpretations of a symbol by symbolists by the peculiarities of the world outlook – the visionary nature of symbolist poetry. All linguistic signs and texts, on the one hand, according to the researcher, continue to represent the “objective world” if they are used by the “uninitiated”, on the other hand, the “sighted”, or a visionary, is able to see the “prototype” of their absolute equivalent in primitiveness. “Energy “radiation” is inseparably connected with such

¹¹ Минц З. Блок и русский символизм. Литературное наследство. 1980. Т. 92. Кн. 1. С. 107.

¹² Бельй А. Символизм. Книга статей. Москва, 1910. С. 70.

¹³ Молчанова Н. Поэзия К.Д. Бальмонта 1890–1910-х гг. : проблемы творческой эволюции : монография. Москва : МПГУ, 2002. С. 17.

¹⁴ Syromlya N. The Explication of the Author’s Traditional Symbolism of the Element Fire in the Poetry of the Russian Symbolist Poet K. Balmont : The Actualization of Zoroastrianism Motives. *Language Art*. Shiraz, Iran, 2019. № 4 (3). P. 103–118. DOI: 10.22046/LA.2019.18.

¹⁵ Кожевникова Н. Словоупотребление в русской поэзии начала XX в. Москва : Наука, 1986. С. 14.

imaginative “insight”: both together create the symbolic effectiveness of “things as signs” of the world text”¹⁶.

We cannot agree with the opinion expressed in the literature that the peculiarity of a symbol among the symbolists is that “its meaning, as a rule, is not derived from the linguistic meaning of words. Only in a number of cases the immediate environment of the word is constructed in such a way that it indicates not so much the meaning of the word as its allegorical character <...>”¹⁷.

Following E. Shelestyuk, we believe that the main reason for the formation of a “symbolic aura” in the signified of a linguistic symbol is that the direct denotational meaning in it itself induces a figurative meaning based on metaphorical and metonymic associations between them¹⁸.

Thus, A. Bely in his work “The Emblematics of Meaning” notes that symbols in the form of lexemes have their own content, i.e. semantics, changing in this context, when “monotony at the level of emphasizing symbolic content” is removed by changing the context, due to which new interpretations and “readings” arise¹⁹.

Researchers of A. Bely’s works pay attention to the concept of the word-body. The presence of complex sign systems and cultural models inside and outside the poetic code is noted, which is complicated by the desire of the symbolists to displace, redefine and cross the boundaries between art and religion, philosophy and science, theory and practice, etc.

The abstract names of these cultural systems, writes Hansen-Loewe A., often appear in verses in the form of personified “symbols”, and then, presented in the clothes of mythological “heroes”, they play out the drama of “kulturkampf”, the collision of heterogeneous semiotic, medial and axiological codes, cultural institutions and its carriers. The scientist refers to such examples of abstract concepts written with capital letters: “Time”, “Symbol”, “Word”, etc. or philosophical concepts “Dionysianism”, “music”, “idea”, etc.²⁰.

¹⁶ Ханзен-Лёве А. Русский символизм. Система поэтических мотивов. Мифопоэтический символизм. Космическая символика. Санкт-Петербург : Академический проект, 2003. С. 9.

¹⁷ Коженикова Н. Словоупотребление в русской поэзии начала XX в. Москва : Наука, 1986. С. 14.

¹⁸ Шелестюк Е. Символ versus троп: сравнительный анализ семантики. *Филологические науки*. 2001. № 6. С. 50.

¹⁹ Ханзен-Лёве А. Русский символизм. Система поэтических мотивов. Мифопоэтический символизм. Космическая символика. Санкт-Петербург : Академический проект, 2003. С. 22.

²⁰ Ханзен-Лёве А. Русский символизм. Система поэтических мотивов. Мифопоэтический символизм. Космическая символика. Санкт-Петербург : Академический проект, 2003. С. 7–8.

A. Bely's and A. Blok's theoretical heritage is mostly thoroughly studied regarding the understanding of a symbol by poets. Let us comment on some statements from these studies.

According to scientists, interpreting the concept of a symbol, A. Bely proceeds from the Kantian-Rickert separation of the phenomenal and noumenal world, a symbol for him is the connection between these worlds, giving rise to an attempt to comprehend the world of noumena in the poetry. Speaking about a structure of a symbol, we note that for A. Bely, the object perceived by consciousness and the state of this consciousness are combined in it, in other words, the word-symbol combines the image of experience and the image of visibility, moreover, the image of experience breaks down into the artist's own mental activity in creating a symbol and the idea that this symbol is the carrier of; the image of visibility is for the first the reality embodied in the work (what is given at the input), and for the second the material given of the work, what has already been embodied²¹.

Thus, the word-symbol was originally an abstract "word-term" of ordinary language for those who direct their receptive ability to the linguistic-semiotic side of the sign, writes A. Hansen-Loewe, but to "people of a symbol", creative people (in the sense of a religion of art in modernism), the symbolic appears at the right moment in life in the form of insights and visionary experience²².

Analyzing statements about A. Blok's symbols, E. Svetsitskaya rightly notes that the symbolic word is a poet's word that unfolds in a specific cultural context, it is "personal, an individual creative space is imposed on the element of life, but in such a way that the element in it remains alive and effective"²³. Thus, a symbol for Blok A. is the recreation of the integrity of the world, which at the same time is not distracted from the consciousness of its original separation (into the world of noumena and phenomena).

Returning to the philosophical origins of the theory of correspondences, which is widely discussed by researchers of symbolism (works by Ermilova, 1989; Iskrzhitskaya, 2000; Mineralova, 2003; Svetsitskaya, 2003, 2005; and other scientists), one should say about its correlation with Plato's ontology and the doctrine of emanations. According to this doctrine, the cosmos forms a vertical hierarchy of layers of being, in which the "content of being" decreases as they move away from absolute primordially, which has a cosmic origin. According to researchers, it is the ability of a word to be

²¹ Свенцицкая Э. Концепции слова и младшие символисты : монография. Донецк : ДонНУ, 2005. С. 98–99.

²² Ханзен-Лёве А. Русский символизм. Система поэтических мотивов. Мифопоэтический символизм. Космическая символика. Санкт-Петербург : Академический проект, 2003. С. 10–11.

²³ Свенцицкая Э. Концепции слова и младшие символисты : монография. Донецк : ДонНУ, 2005. С. 137.

associated with something outside of it (a signified entity, with a person) that defines the symbolic nature of the word, which determines the appeal to the etymology of the concept “symbol” – the ancient Greek “simballo” – “I connect together”²⁴.

2. Semantic content of the concept “symbol” in Russian symbolists’ poetry

Symbolists repeatedly refer to the etymology of the word “symbol”: for example, V. Bryusov, D. Merezhkovsky make a start from the interpretation of a symbol as “connection”, A. Bely interprets it as “fusion of meanings”²⁵. For the poet, the symbol is “only the exponent of the experience, and the experience (personal, collective) is the only reality”²⁶.

To clarify the general and individual author’s understanding of the category of symbol, let us turn to the conceptual analysis of the name “symbol” in K. Balmont’s, A. Bely’s, A. Blok’s and V. Brusov’s works.

We have identified fragments containing the lexeme “symbol”, the analysis of it allows us to highlight the semantic content of the concept in the symbolist poetic discourse.

The analysis of the meanings of the concept “symbol” in the poetry of K. Balmont, A. Bely, A. Blok and V. Brusov made it possible to identify common semes: the emotional-sensual world of a human, the connection with mythology and religion.

M. Svetsitskaya E. also notes that the idea of the symbolic word as a mediator between the phenomenal and noumenal worlds, the world of essences and the world of phenomena is common to all symbolists²⁷.

So it is worth to pay attention to the fact that the symbolists were distinguished by exceptional knowledge in mythology and hermeticism, they were well acquainted with the scientific knowledge of their time: “every mythological poet-symbolist was highly “reflexive”, extremely committed to theoretical thinking <...>”, all this can explain the peculiarity of a symbol which causes a highly ambivalent feeling of vision and illusion, imagination and fiction, the immediacy of ecstasism and the mediation of reflexivity²⁸.

²⁴ Свенцицкая Э. Концепции слова и младшие символисты : монография. Донецк : ДонНУ, 2005. С. 236.

²⁵ Ханзен-Лёве А. Русский символизм. Система поэтических мотивов. Мифопоэтический символизм. Космическая символика. Санкт-Петербург : Академический проект, 2003. С. 19.

²⁶ Белый А. Символизм. Книга статей. Москва, 1910. С. 124–125.

²⁷ Свенцицкая Э. Концепции слова и младшие символисты : монография. Донецк : ДонНУ, 2005. С. 236.

²⁸ Ханзен-Лёве А. Русский символизм. Система поэтических мотивов. Мифопоэтический символизм. Космическая символика. Санкт-Петербург : Академический проект, 2003. С. 18.

Summarizing the diverse understanding of a symbol by symbolists, we can, following A. Hansen-Loewe, summarize the symbolist “symbol-myth” in its main features: each symbol has semiotic (linguistic in a broad sense) and real-objective properties; it is simultaneously a sign of something “other” (metaphysical “other world”) and “itself” (as a component of the “cosmic world of things”, “word-thing”). And vice versa: anything, any reality of the earthly life is a sign, a part of a universal language as the “world text” of the cosmos is presented. However, such an imaginative presence is not inherent in things and signs in the form of a material substance, but is achieved only by experience, the principle of “experiencing” pervades all symbolist theories of a symbol and those thinkers in the history of religion whom symbolists appeal to²⁹.

Having determined the general and individual features of understanding the category of a symbol by Russian symbolist poets, we will analyze the existing linguistic approaches to studying a symbol.

A feature of studying a symbol from the standpoint of cognitive linguistics is the synthesis of various approaches to the analysis of a linguistic phenomenon.

The culturological direction is presented, first of all, in the works of Yu. Lotman. According to the scientist, the symbol is associated with the memory of culture and a number of symbolic images pervades the entire history of mankind or its large layers vertically, while the artist’s individuality is manifested in actualization of archaic images and creation of occasional symbols³⁰.

The cognitive aspect of a symbol, from the point of view of linguistics and cultural linguistics, is presented in the works of V. Maslova. The author, referring a symbol to the stereotyped phenomena of artistic culture, comes to the conclusion that “a symbol is a thing awarded with meaning”³¹, it has a number of distinctive features: imagery, motivation, the presence of an archetypal nature, national specificity; “as a result of cognitive activity, a system of meanings is created that relates to what the individual knows and thinks about the world. The study of how a person operates with symbols, comprehending both the world and himself in the world, has combined

²⁹ Ханзен-Лёве А. Русский символизм. Система поэтических мотивов. Мифопоэтический символизм. Космическая символика. Санкт-Петербург : Академический проект, 2003. С. 9.

³⁰ Лотман Ю. Внутри мыслящих миров : Человек – текст. Семиосфера – История. Москва : Языки русской культуры, 1996. С. 123.

³¹ Маслова В. Лингвокультурология : учебное пособие для студентов высших учебных заведений. Москва : Издательский центр «Академия», 2001. С. 102.

linguistics with other disciplines that study a human and society, and has created cognitive linguistics”³².

It should be noted that Yu. Stepanov, analyzing the role and place of the studied category within the framework of symbolism, defines a symbol as “an idealized representation of what we now call a concept”³³.

One of the points of view is expressed in the works of V. Kolesov, he develops his understanding of a symbol as a meaningful form of a concept and writes about a typical for Russian mentality construction of synthetic expression models: “a symbolic image appears <...> as the main manifestation of a concept <...> it is “a kind of a concept” which is constantly recreated by superimposing an image on a well-known symbol”³⁴.

We find a *linguistic approach* to the study of a symbol in the works of A. Potebnya, V. Vinogradov, E. Usovik, E. Kravchenko, N. Afanasyeva, A. Eliseeva, L. Svarichevskaya and other scientists.

A. Potebnya made the first attempt at a linguistic study of a symbol based on folk poetry: he identified three ways of expressing a symbol – comparison, opposition and the relation of causality. The researcher noted that the most difficult way of expressing a symbol in a language is causal relations, which “live out their days” in folk methods of treatment, rituals, they can be found in the highest forms of folk poetry³⁵.

According to A. Potebnya, a symbol is explicated with the help of a word and reflects not the entire content of the concept, but one of the features that seems to be the most important to the popular view³⁶.

E. Kravchenko analyzes symbols in the early poetry of A. Bely and offers a number of definitions of a symbol, that represents a multilayer structure and consists of different types of meanings. So, for example, a symbol is a special image of a literary text, a sign in which the following constituents are synthesized: the objective meaning (the image of reality), the meaning arising from the inner form of the word, sometimes turning into the mythological, deep meaning of the poet’s unconsciously experienced consciousness, and the meaning that arises in the perceiver³⁷.

³² Маслова В. Homo Lingualis в культуре : монография. Витебск : Издательство УО «ВТУ имени П.М. Машерова», 2004. С. 8.

³³ Степанов Ю. Протей : Очерки хаотической эволюции. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2004. С. 67.

³⁴ Колесов В. Язык и ментальность. Санкт-Петербург : Петербургское Востоковедение, 2004. С. 30.

³⁵ Потebня А. О некоторых символах в славянской народной поэзии. *Слово и миф в народной культуре* / А. Потebня. Москва, 1989. С. 288.

³⁶ Потebня А. О некоторых символах в славянской народной поэзии *Слово и миф в народной культуре* / А. Потebня. Москва, 1989. С. 285.

³⁷ Кравченко Э. Система символов в языке ранней поэзии А. Белого : дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.02. Москва, 1994. С. 6.

This definition, in our opinion, unites the literary, linguistic, psychological aspects of the concept of a symbol, which quite fully reflects the essence of the phenomenon and the peculiarity of understanding of a symbol by A. Bely, however, it does not allow to distinguish it from the interpretation from the literary point of view. Studies often note that the term “symbol” is understood differently by literary scholars and linguists. Yu. Stepanov, for example, claims that a symbol is not a scientific concept, it is a concept of poetics; every time it is significant within the framework of a certain poetic system, and it is true only in it³⁸.

A special place in scientific discussions is occupied by the question of the contiguity of the concepts “symbol” and “image”.

Indeed, according to many researchers, a symbol is based on an image. Following A. Losev in the works of modern linguists a special poetic image in a series of tropes, designated by a word or phrase, in which the ideal content is embodied is understood as “a symbol in a narrow sense”³⁹.

The correlation of a symbol with an image is presented in the dissertation of M. Elisova, the author uses the definition of a symbol formulated in the works of N. Slukhay: a symbol is “an ambiguous subject-conceptual image, located at the intersection of different planes of reproducible reality, which has the features of internal similarity”⁴⁰.

E. Usovik’s analysis of the fairy tales by M. Saltykov-Shchedrin, shows that “a symbol is a polysemantic image”, one of the features of which is a multilayered semantic structure⁴¹, however, the given definition does not indicate the boundaries of the expression of a symbol and its difference from an image, it complicates linguistic analysis.

For example, V. Maslova writes that any symbol is an image, but an image can be considered a symbol only under certain conditions. N. Fry identifies the following criteria for the “symbolism” of an image in the poetry: 1) the presence of an abstract symbolic meaning is explicated (manifested) by the context; 2) the image is presented in such a way that its literal interpretation is impossible or insufficient; 3) the image implies (hides) the association with a

³⁸ Маслова В. Лингвокультурология : учебное пособие для студентов высших учебных заведений. Москва : Издательский центр «Академия», 2001. С. 96.

³⁹ Красикова Е. Семантика символа в языке художественной литературы (на материале русской реалистической прозы конца XIX – начала XX в.) : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.02. Москва, 1986.

⁴⁰ Елисова М. Универсальный символ «мировое древо» и его образно-речевые парадигмы в художественных текстах Б. Пастернака : дис. ...канд. филол. наук: 10.02.02. Киев, 2006. С. 6.

⁴¹ Усовик Е. Окациональное слово с символическим значением в сказках М.Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина. XXIV Зональная конференция литературоведческих кафедр университетов и пединститутов Поволжья. I Конференция филологов Поволжского региона. Ч. 1 : Лингвистика. Тверь, 1995. С. 88.

myth, a legend, folklore⁴². All these signs of a symbol are correlated with the structural elements of a linguistic symbol as a semiotic concept and reflect our vision of the structure of a linguistic symbol.

According to N. Arutyunova, in contrast to an image, a symbol is a reflection of the structure of a semiotic concept (the idea of a three-component structure: the signified, the signifying, a sign). Linguists note the following peculiarity of the names “symbol” and “image”. An image is not used in a copular position: one cannot say that *a ruby is an image of life force*, and a symbol is peculiar to use in a relational sense: “Space is a symbol of a person’s power, time is a symbol of his powerlessness; The circle is a symbol of eternity”⁴³.

A. Eliseeva, analyzing symbolism of the “thingish” world in the lyrics of I. Annensky, considers a symbol “in contrast to an image, which is unstable and closely related to the context, and from the concept, which is semantically limited and in which the national shades are leveled out, to be a definite and stable representation of the concept” and she calls a symbol a “figurative concept”⁴⁴. We agree with the opinion of the researcher that a symbol is a form of existence of a concept (see also: V. Kolesov, 2004), since in this positioning of a symbol, the relationship between a symbol and a word as a form of its expression is clearly traced.

Close attention to the functioning of a symbol in a literary text is due to the understanding of the text as a cultural communicative system: in modern studies, a symbol is called a living creation of the new in the guise of the old⁴⁵, scientists note the text-forming function of a symbol⁴⁶.

In literary criticism and linguistics, there are works devoted either to a symbolism of one author as a whole (Muryanov, 1996; Kravchenko, 1994; Ivanyuk, 1997; and other scientists), or to individual symbols in the works of different authors (Gorchak, 2005; Eliseeva, 2004; Elisova, 2006; Magomedova, 1990; Mnih, 2002; Petrichenko, 2004; Rakhimova, 1996; Samodelova, 1992; Samusenko, 2004; Snitko, 2002; Chaginskaya, 1991; and other researchers).

The work of Z. Vasilko (2003) is devoted to the study of the process of symbolizing the meaning of a word on the material of Ukrainian names of

⁴² Маслова В. Лингвистический анализ экспрессивности художественного текста : учебное пособие. Минск, 1997. С. 99.

⁴³ Референция и проблемы текстообразования : сборник научных трудов. Москва : Наука, 1988. С. 119, 127.

⁴⁴ Елисеева А. Символика «вещного» мира в лирике И. Анненского. *Филологические науки*. 2000. № 6. С. 56.

⁴⁵ Колесов В. Язык и ментальность. Санкт-Петербург : Петербургское Востоковедение, 2004. С. 79.

⁴⁶ Солодуб Ю. Текстобразующая функция символа в художественном произведении. *Филологические науки*. 2002. С. 46–55.

fauna in folklore; L. Belekhova (1999, 2002) explores verbal images-symbols at the junction of cognitive and semiotic approaches based on the material of American poetry; the work of a generalizing nature “Symbols of the Ukrainian language” is presented by V. Kononenko (1996) and others.

3. Justification of a linguistic approach to the research of a symbol

According to N. Afanasyeva’s remark⁴⁷, in the existing linguistic studies of a symbol, either its individual features are given (E. Rakhimova drew attention to the repetition of a symbol in the article devoted to the symbolic image “blue / fiery red flower and a swan” in “Kalevala” neoromanticism)⁴⁸, or the sources of the appearance of symbols in the author’s work are revealed.

Such sources can be folklore texts (see the work of E. Samodelova “S.A. Yesenin’s symbolism of color and the wedding poetry of Ryazan region”), myths and philosophical teachings of ancient thinkers (see the works of D. Magomedova “Symbol of “soul” in “The Heavy Lyre” of V. Khodasevich, 1990; E. Chaginskaya “Symbolism of a number in the lyrics of Federico Garcia Lorca”, 1991) or “a purely author’s perception, giving rise to a special intratextual conjugation of nominative and figurative meanings of a word sign”⁴⁹.

Symbols as one of the components of the semantics of an image within the framework of the logical-semiotic framework method proposed by N. Slukhay are analyzed by the author on the basis of the poetry of T. Shevchenko and M. Lermontov. The analysis of the symbolic meanings of the paradigm of the images of the elements of fire, water, earth and air in the works of N. Gumilyov and V. Khlebnikov can be found in the studies of O. Petrichenko, in Russian teletexts – in the dissertation of O. Samusenko. However, these works do not provide criteria for assigning an image or its meaning to a symbol.

In the work of N. Afanasyeva, dedicated to the linguistic study of symbols in the works of M. Tsvetaeva, clear criteria for assigning a word to a symbol are proposed: the immediate surrounding of the word-explicator of a symbol contains a mythologeme and archetypal oppositions (according to Ivanov Vs. Vyach. and V. Toporov), also a symbol has access to the cultural context. The researcher has developed a technique for identifying and analyzing

⁴⁷ Афанасьева Н. Символы как семиотические концепты языковой «модели мира» Марины Цветаевой: дис. ...канд. филол. наук: 10.02.02. Череповец, 2001. С. 4.

⁴⁸ Рахимова Э. Повторяемость символического образа (голубой / огненно-красный цветок и лебедь) в калевальском неоромантизме. *Филологические науки*. 1996. № 6. С. 23–31.

⁴⁹ Елисева А. Символика «вещного» мира в лирике И. Анненского. *Филологические науки*. 2000. № 6. С. 46.

a linguistic symbol, examples of conceptual analysis of traditional and author's symbols in the language "model of the world" by M. Tsvetaeva are given⁵⁰.

Thus, there are various criteria for highlighting a symbol in a text and approaches to its study. Here is the statement of V. Vinogradov, who also takes the position of the linguistic analysis of a symbol: "<...> a characteristic feature of a symbol is the conditioning of its meaning by the entire composition of a given "esthetic object"⁵¹, that is, a symbol for a scientist is a modus of a lexeme, a word transformed in the context of a given work.

Thus, as A. Potebnya rightly noted, only from the point of view of language the symbols can be put in order⁵².

The first researchers of the poetic language of the symbolists were the poets themselves: V. Bryusov, A. Bely, Viach. Ivanov, I. Annensky⁵³, since, according to V. Vinogradov, "within the framework of modernity, comprehension of the originality of the individual poetic style can be especially acute as a closed system of linguistic means"⁵⁴.

N. Kozhevnikova defines an unevenness of the study of the symbolists' language in connection with the interest of philologists in the works of A. Blok and against this background insufficient attention to the language of his contemporaries. The author of the book "Word usage in the Russian poetry of the XIX–XX centuries" refers to the paper of V. Hoffman "The Language of the Symbolists" as the most competent. To the number of recent studies in this area at the junction of linguistics and literary criticism works by A. Hansen-Loewe can be added: "Art as religion. Poetry of Early Symbolism", "Russian Symbolism: A System of Poetic Motives. Mythopoetic symbolism" and others, in which the most complete bibliography of studies of the poetry of Russian symbolism is presented.

The creative heritage of the Russian symbolists from the point of view of linguistics has been studied from different points of view: dissertations by E. Akastelova (1996), N. Aksarina (2001), Yu. Vishnitskaya (2003), I. Gazheva (2002), A. Kopacheva (2003), T. Korneeva (2001), Yu. Lazebnik (1996), V. Rozsohi (1995), I. Soina (1996) are devoted to the problems of the syntax of symbolist prose and poetry, the peculiarities of the use of

⁵⁰ Афанасьева Н. Символы как семиотические концепты языковой «модели мира» Марины Цветаевой : дис. ...канд. филол. наук: 10.02.02. Череповец, 2001. С. 88–90.

⁵¹ Виноградов В. Избранные труды. Поэтика русской литературы. Москва, 1976. С. 374.

⁵² Потebня А. О некоторых символах в славянской народной поэзии. *Слово и миф в народной культуре* / А. Потebня. Москва, 1989. С. 289.

⁵³ Кожевникова Н. Словоупотребление в русской поэзии начала XX в. Москва : Наука, 1986. С. 4.

⁵⁴ Кожевникова Н. Словоупотребление в русской поэзии начала XX в. Москва : Наука, 1986. С. 4.

complex adjectives, studies of color symbolism, mythologemes, etc. Works by O. Agapkina, P. Bitsilli, A. Grigorash, A. Grishunin, N. Kozhevnikova, E. Kradozhen, L. Krasnova, L. Kurilova, E. Makarenko, S. Nadirov, L. Novikov, T. Petrova, N. Pinezhaninova, Yu. Proklov, V. Solovieva, N. Shanskiy and other scientists are appealed to the issues of innovation in word usage and word formation, the study of emotional vocabulary, metaphors and comparisons in symbolist poetry, etc.

The linguistic features of a symbol as the main, nuclear, element of a work of art in the poetry of the symbolists and the means of its creation, linguistic means of expressing the traditional and author's symbolism of universal symbols are studied in our papers.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, in a situation of a variety of contexts, the word-explicator of a symbol falls into a different linguistic environment, is filled with a set of attributes and begins to possess a special property – “reflexivity” (G. Vinokur's term), i.e. facing itself. Bringing together words in the text that have long lost the mutual connection that they possessed due to the etymological kinship, or even never had this connection, a poet, as if, discovers new, unexpected meanings in them⁵⁵.

Reflexivity in poetry is more relevant than in prose: in a small text space it is necessary to express maximum meaning, which increases the semantic load of the word. The emergence of new meanings is especially important for a symbol as a “plot gene”, according to M. Lotman (1996), synthesizing and storing them.

Scientists note that one of the features of the functioning of a symbol in the poetic speech of Russian symbolists is its inclusion in the structure of aphorism: A. Bely defines an aphorism as “a bridge to a symbol”⁵⁶. M. Gasparov also draws attention to a similar relationship, saying that, for example, in the works of M. Tsvetaeva, whom researchers rank among the “second conscripts of the symbolic army” and call the “epigone of symbolism”, a thought is most often expressed in aphoristic form, compressed to a symbol⁵⁷.

Thus, any concept can exist in the mind of the author and the researcher and, at the same time, function in a language in which it has its own specific content – primary, influencing both an author and a researcher as users of a language.

⁵⁵ Винокур Г. О языке художественной литературы : учебное пособие для филологических специальностей вузов. Москва : Высшая школа, 1991. С. 30.

⁵⁶ Белый А. Символизм как миропонимание. Москва : Республика, 1994. С. 250.

⁵⁷ Гаспаров М. Антиномичность поэтики русского модернизма. *Связь времен. Проблемы преемственности в русской литературе конца XIX – начала XX в.* / М. Гаспаров. Москва, 1992. С. 9.

The review of approaches to the study of a symbol and its interpretations clearly shows that there is no consensus among scientists, but the material we study – the poetry of Russian symbolists – requires precisely a linguistic foundation that allows us to identify and analyze the meanings of symbols.

SUMMARY

The article is devoted to the analysis of various approaches to the study of symbols in poetic speech. The linguistic approach to identifying and interpreting a symbol in the lyrics of Russian symbolists against the background of cultural and cognitive ones is substantiated, which makes it possible to study the explication of traditional symbolism and individual author's content of the symbol, as well as to highlight the paradigm of meanings of the analyzed phenomenon common to the symbolist worldview based on the poetry of K. Balmont, A. Bely, A. Blok and V. Brusov.

REFERENCES

1. Асоян Ю., Малафеев А. Открытие идеи культуры : опыт русской культурологии середины XIX – начала XX в. Москва : ОГИ, 2001. 344 с.
2. Афанасьева Н. Символы как семиотические концепты языковой «модели мира» Марины Цветаевой : дис. ...канд. филол. наук: 10.02.02. Череповец, 2001. 170 с.
3. Белый А. Символизм. Книга статей. Москва, 1910. 633 с.
4. Белый А. Символизм как миропонимание. Москва : Республика, 1994. 528 с.
5. Винокур Г. О языке художественной литературы : учебное пособие для филологических специальностей вузов. Москва : Высшая школа, 1991. 448 с.
6. Виноградов В. Избранные труды. Поэтика русской литературы. Москва, 1976. 508 с.
7. Гаспаров М. Антиномичность поэтики русского модернизма. *Связь времен. Проблемы преемственности в русской литературе конца XIX – начала XX в.* / М. Гаспаров Москва, 1992. С. 244–263.
8. Елисева А. Символика «вещного» мира в лирике И. Анненского. *Филологические науки*. 2000. № 6. С. 56–66.
9. Елисова М. Универсальный символ «мировое древо» и его образно–речевые парадигмы в художественных текстах Б. Пастернака : дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.02. Киев, 2006. 242 с.
10. Кожевникова Н. Словоупотребление в русской поэзии начала XX в. Москва : Наука, 1986. 256 с.
11. Колесов В. Язык и ментальность. Санкт-Петербург : Петербургское Востоковедение, 2004. 240 с.

12. Кравченко Э. Система символов в языке ранней поэзии А. Белого : дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.02. Москва, 1994. 202 с.
13. Красикова Е. Семантика символа в языке художественной литературы : на материале русской реалистической прозы конца XIX – начала XX в. : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.02. Москва, 1986. 15 с.
14. Лосев А. Проблема символа и реалистическое искусство. Москва : 1976. 367 с.
15. Лотман Ю. Внутри мыслящих миров : Человек – текст. Семиосфера – История. Москва : Языки русской культуры, 1996. 447 с.
16. Маслова В. Лингвистический анализ экспрессивности художественного текста : учебное пособие. Минск, 1997. 156 с.
17. Маслова В. Лингвокультурология : учебное пособие для студентов высших учебных заведений. Москва : Издательский центр «Академия», 2001. 208 с.
18. Маслова В. Homo Lingualis в культуре : монография. Витебск : Издательство УО «ВТУ имени П.М. Машерова», 2004. 214 с.
19. Минералова И. Русская литература серебряного века : Поэтика символизма. Москва : Флинта ; Наука, 2003. 272 с.
20. Минц З. Блок и русский символизм. Литературное наследство. 1980. Т. 92. Кн. 1. С. 98–172.
21. Молчанова Н. Поэзия К.Д. Бальмонта 1890–1910-х гг. : проблемы творческой эволюции : монография. Москва : МПГУ, 2002. 146 с.
22. Потебня А. О некоторых символах в славянской народной поэзии *Слово и миф в народной культуре* / А. Потебня. Москва, 1989. С. 285–378.
23. Рахимова Э. Повторяемость символического образа (голубой / огненно-красный цветок и лебедь) в калевальском неоромантизме. *Филологические науки*. 1996. № 6. С. 23–31.
24. Референция и проблемы текстообразования : сборник научных трудов. Москва : Наука, 1988. 238 с.
25. Русская литература XX в. : Школы, направления, методы творческой работы. Санкт-Петербург : Logos ; Москва : Высшая школа, 2002. 586 с.
26. Свенцицкая Э. Концепции слова и младшие символисты : монография. Донецк : ДонНУ, 2005. 266 с.
27. Солодуб Ю. Textoобразующая функция символа в художественном произведении. *Филологические науки*. 2002. № 2. С. 46–55.
28. Степанов Ю. Протей : Очерки хаотической эволюции. Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2004. 264 с.
29. Сыромля Н. The Explication of the Author's Traditional Symbolism of the Element Fire in the Poetry of the Russian Symbolist Poet

K. Balmont : The Actualization of Zoroastrianism Motives. *Language Art*. Shiraz, Iran, 2019. № 4 (3). P. 103–118. DOI: 10.22046/LA.2019.18. DOR: 98.1000/2476-6526.1398.4.103.12.3.1575.1606
<https://doi.org/10.22046/LA.2019.18>.

30. Усовик Е. Оказиональное слово с символическим значением в сказках М.Е. Салтыкова-Щедрина. *XXIV Зональная конференция литературоведческих кафедр университетов и пединститутов Поволжья. I Конференция филологов Поволжского региона*. Ч. 1: Лингвистика. Тверь, 1995. С. 88–89.

31. Ханзен-Лёве А. Русский символизм. Система поэтических мотивов. Мифопоэтический символизм. Космическая символика. Санкт-Петербург : Академический проект, 2003. 816 с.

32. Шелестюк Е. Символ versus троп : сравнительный анализ семантики. *Филологические науки*. 2001. № 6. С. 50–58.

33. Энциклопедия символизма. Живопись, графика и скульптура. Литература. Музыка. Москва : Республика, 1999. 429 с.

Information about the authors:

Syromlia N. M.,

Ph. D.,

Associate Professor at the Foreign Languages Department
Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design
2, Nemirovich-Danchenko str., Kyiv, 01011, Ukraine

Krasniuk S. O.,

Senior Lecturer at the Foreign Languages Department
Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design
2, Nemirovich-Danchenko str., Kyiv, 01011, Ukraine