

**LINGUISTIC-CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF SILENCE IN THE
NOVEL "IVAN" BY V.O. BOGOMOLOV****CAMILLA LICARI**

Abstract. A review of the verbal and nonverbal representations of the concept of silence and its cognitive and propositional structure in the literary context is presented in this paper. The research is based on the novel "Ivan" (1957) by Vladimir O. Bogomolov and the aim is to decode the general linguistic layer underlying the literary concept of silence and to discover the author's intention in the linguistic means of objectifying the concept. Using the pragmatic expressive and aesthetic approach typical of a literary text, the author narrates the mysterious story of Ivan, a twelve-year-old boy found in the water near the riverbank and arrested on suspicion of espionage. By employing the metaphor of silence, the author focuses on describing the boy's private history, deprived of his childhood, which he reverently guards in his silence, devoting more attention to that than to the depiction of military episodes. The article deals with a variety of verbalizations of the conceptual content of silence, revealing the author's individual perceptions of it, allowing him to present the conceptosphere of silence as a field, the core of which is a generalized cognitive and propositional structure that includes the main lexical representations of the concept. Figurative meanings constitute the immediate periphery, while subjective-modal meanings are the further periphery. Such an analysis helps to reveal the functions of the concept in focus and, consequently, to interpret the individual-authorial image of the world and broaden the understanding of the narrative text itself.

Keywords: *linguistic analysis, conceptual analysis, literary text analysis, concept, silence, Vladimir Bogomolov, Russian literature*

**ЛИНГВОКОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ТИШИНЫ В
ПОВЕСТИ В.О. БОГОМОЛОВА «ИВАН»****КАМИЛЛА ЛИКАРИ**

Аннотация. В статье представлен обзор вербальных и невербальных репрезентаций концепта молчания и его когнитивной и пропозициональной структуры в литературном контексте. Исследование основано на романе Владимира Олеговича Богомолова «Иван» (1957) и ставит своей целью расшифровку общезыкового пласта, лежащего в основе литературного концепта молчания, и раскрытие авторского замысла в языковых средствах объективации концепта. С характерным для художественного текста прагматическим выразительно-эстетическим приемом автор повествует загадочную историю Ивана, двенадцатилетнего мальчика, найденного в воде у берега реки и арестованного по подозрению в шпионаже. Используя метафору молчания, автор акцентирует внимание на описании личной истории мальчика, лишённого детства, которое он благоговейно оберегает в своем молчании, уделяя этому больше внимание, чем изображению военных эпизодов.

В статье рассматриваются разнообразные вербализации понятийного содержания молчания, выявляющие индивидуальные авторские представления о нем, позволяющие выявить концептосферу молчания как поле, ядром которого является обобщенная когнитивно-пропозициональная структура, включающая основные лексические репрезентации понятия. Образные значения составляют непосредственную периферию, а субъективно-модальные значения — дальнейшую периферию. Такой анализ помогает выявить функции рассматриваемого концепта и, следовательно, интерпретировать индивидуально-авторский образ мира и расширить понимание самого текста.

Ключевые слова: лингвистический анализ, концептуальный анализ, анализ художественного текста, концепт, тишина, Владимир Богомолов, русская литература

Over the decades, the study of the text has aroused the interest of many researchers, including literary critics and linguists that consider the text from fundamentally different positions. The multilevel nature of the text, especially the literary text, explains the diversity of disciplines involved in its study, as well as the heterogeneity of definitions attributed to it.

The literary text has mainly become an object of literary studies, traditionally focused on the thematic and ideological content and genre specifics of literary works. Nevertheless, in the second half of the 20th century text linguistics found its place in the analysis of literary text along with literary studies, recognizing the inherent complexity of the text, which «turns one side of itself to literary studies, and the other side to linguistics»¹ [Slyusareva, 1982, p.41]. After all, in a literary text the plan of expression is no less significant than the plan of content: by means of specially selected and organized linguistic means, the author conveys not only the external narrative content, but also what can be read *between the lines*, by interpreting and analysing all levels of the text.

In this regard, in terms of expression (word) [Zemskaya, 2010, p.71], the text is considered as a product of speech and thinking activity, that is, as a communicative act, and the methods and principles of its generation require study; while in terms of content (idea) [Ibid.], is analysed its perception, inevitably connected with functional and pragmatic aspects, which are the main features of the organization of any text. However, unlike the nonfiction text, which is based on the laws of logical thinking, the literary text is built on the laws of associative-imaginative, and, consequently, subjective thinking, not only of the author (the speaker), but also of the reader (the listener): «The word belongs equally to the speaker and the listener, and therefore its meaning consists not in that it has a certain meaning for the speaker, but in that it is capable of having meaning in general. Only by virtue of the fact that the content of the word is capable of growing, the word can be a means of understanding others. <...> Art is the language of the artist, and just as by means of a word one cannot communicate one's thought to another, but can only awaken one's own thought in him, so one cannot communicate it in a work of art either; therefore, the content of the latter (when it is finished) develops not in the artist, but in the one who understands» [Potebnya, 1976, p.180-181].

¹ Hereinafter, unless otherwise indicated, the translation is ours. – C.L.

The literary text, thus, implies the presence of a subtextual, interpretive functional plane, in which the author manipulates the material of life in accordance with his own communicative, creative and emotional needs, creating a parallel universe in the image of reality [Valgina, 2003, p.70], which, nevertheless, is open to the reader, a kind of «invitation to co-authoring» [Zemskaya, 1976, p.34], addressed to him, the «co-worker» [Eco, 2018, p.18], who creates his own text.

The multidimensional nature of the literary text has led to the development of various approaches to its study. According to several diverse trends of modern studies of the content side of the verbal sign, including traditional philology and linguistics, close attention is paid to the study of the concept, in particular the literary concept, especially by cognitive semantics. Although there is no unique definition of the term *concept* in the scientific literature, when comparing different approaches, several constant components can be distinguished, which allow to identify concepts as essential units of language and to consider them in connection with the processes of speech and cognition, in other words, the interaction of thinking subjects, which in the literary context are the author and the reader.

Literary text, by virtue of its inherent wide range of styles and ways of expression, provides an opportunity to consider a «form of life-embodiment», which is, by definition, artificial, that is imitating reality, serving as a tool to convey a different content [Valgina, 2003, p.70]. Thus, a comprehensive analysis of the text allows to make the fullest possible picture of the linguistic strategies that can inform new meanings not only to the concepts as such, but also to the text itself as a complex speech act.

The present work is devoted to the analysis of verbal and non-verbal representation of the concept *silence* and its cognitive and propositional structure in the literary context. The following analysis is carried out according to the working scheme developed on the basis of the cognitive and pragmatic approach of L.G. Babenko [2009], supplemented by the communicative approach of N.S. Valgina [2003]. In particular, key concepts of the text under study are analysed, first from the pragmatic point of view, namely in connection with the communicative context, and then from the cognitive point of view, taking into account the whole conceptual structure. To this purpose, we have created a linguistic corpus with the support of the online program Sketch Engine, which has been used to simplify the analysis and ensure accurate counting of keyword occurrences and their collocation in the text. The research material is the novel «Ivan» (1957) by Vladimir Osipovich Bogomolov. The ultimate aim of the study is to decode the general linguistic layer underlying the artistic concept of *silence* and to discover the author's intention in the linguistic means of objectification of the concept.

The novel «Ivan» is the debut work of V.O. Bogomolov, at the time no one known thirty years old veteran, who has no relation to writing. More than ten years after the end of the World War II, Bogomolov entered the literary scene with a laconic and emotionally uncolored tale of war and childhood, winning favor among critics and readers.

The author recounts the enigmatic story of Ivan, a twelve-year-old boy

found in the water near the bank of the Dnieper River and detained on suspicion of military espionage, applying the expressive-aesthetic pragmatic setting typical for a literary text [Valgina, 2003, pp.14-15], within the framework of which description and narration alternate, as constituting functional and semantic types of speech [Ibid., p. 46], and dialogic paragraphs, in which the voice of the main character, however, almost always remains weak, barely audible, and often absent altogether. Ivan's non-participation in communication underscores from the very first lines of the story silence as a defining feature not only of the character, but of the entire work: «– Crawled in the water near the shore. Doesn't say why, <...> Doesn't answer my questions: I will only talk to my commander. He seems to be weakened, or maybe he is just pretending» [Bogomolov, 2014, p.6].

The fact that the protagonist of the story is Ivan is evidenced by the title of the work. However, the reader can only guess which of the characters is Ivan during the first two chapters, until at the end of the second one his name is spoken for the first time by an officer of the intelligence department of the army headquarters and his friend Kholin, who finally came for him. As we can see, silence as a mystery is significant from the beginning and at the level of the plot of the story. After Ivan is detained, he is subjected to a real interrogation, during which he really resists heroically and *silently* (italics ours – C.L.), not answering any of the questions of the young senior lieutenant Galtsev, the battalion commander and narrator of the story. The only information the boy provides is his supposed surname (which also turns out to be false by the end of the story), his headquarters' number, and the names of the officers to whom he demands to be immediately informed of his arrival. Little else is known about Ivan throughout the story; he is mostly told about him through other people's mouths: «The whole narrative is like a system of mirrors. Ivan himself does in fact do little and is little described. <...> No “method”, except one that is open and natural. This consists in the fact that we learn almost everything about Ivan from the reactions of various people to him rather than from his own actions in their reality and detail. There is a certain mystery in Ivan, and it is felt by the narrator – the young officer, and the soldiers, and the colonel, and Kholin, and others» [Gusev, 1975, p.256].

It is considered significant that the narrator is neither Ivan nor the heterodiegetic narrator, because this condenses the mystery surrounding the boy's life, forcing the reader to learn the details of the story gradually, from the first person or from Galtsev's memories. Such a narrative technique, in accordance with U. Eco's definition, characterizes the so-called «exemplary author» who manifests himself as a style and addresses the «empirical reader», encouraging him, in turn, to become a «exemplary reader» who represents «a reader-type that the text not only envisions as a co-worker, but also seeks to create» [Eco, 2018, p.18].

In the alternation of first-person narrative and descriptive functional and semantic types of speech [Valgina, 2003, p.46] not only Galtsev's subjective point of view, but also the uncertainty of his manner of narration, description and evaluation of his surrounding reality is noticeable. Galtsev's narrative is filled with units of subjective-modal meaning (introductory words and expressions of subjectivity (19)), such as «it seems to me», «as I determined», «as I

guessed», «as I felt», and a massive use of indefinite pronouns and adverbs (44), such as *some, once, somewhere*. All these elements immerse the reader in an obscure space of reticence, where silence becomes an integral part and attribute of the narrator's memory. And although in the novel the author relies on the real facts of the military past, the war is often only a focal point, obviously dissonant with the chronotope of silence, manifested, on the one hand, at the spatial level, where the war denotes «the other side» – the opposite bank of the river, occupied by the Germans:

«My dugout was in the undergrowth, seven hundred meters from the Dnieper River, separating us from the Germans. <...> The stillness of the night was intermittently broken by jerky machine-gun bursts: at night the Germans methodically, – as our regiment commander said, “for prevention” – every few minutes fired on our coastal strip and the river itself» [Bogomolov, 2019, p.20].

And on the other hand, on the temporal level, where the war manifests itself through the opposition of the beginnings of chaos (war) and harmony (peace):

«It was quiet in the grove where we camped, <...> Now I was reminded of my native village, <...> Memories of childhood ended as soon as I came to the edge. The road was full of German cars, burned, hit and simply abandoned; dead Germans were lying in various poses, in ditches; grey mounds of corpses were visible everywhere in the trench-strewn field» [Ibid., pp.87-88].

Dialogue as a form of speech, on the other hand, is «a transversal literary device on the basis of which the work is built, both content-wise and compositionally» [Valgina, 2003, p.110], used by the author to verbally reproduce the mysterious silence enveloping the entire action. After all, the fact that the fiction text takes the form of a fictional picture of the real world forces the author to resort to literary techniques for a convincing depiction of reality. Consequently, the development of the content of the work, that is, the artistic idea, and its embodiment in specific details is realized, including in the style, which binds the entire work, becoming also a means of self-transmission of the author [Ibid., pp.159-161].

The story actually shows how, thanks to the multifaceted character of the literary style, the author has the opportunity to saturate the text, resorting both to colloquialism (we can notice the use of colloquial expressions and terms, and jargon: *to tell fairy tales; mischievous; wretch*, etc.) and to the formal style: «In accordance with the directive of the Supreme Command of the armed forces of 11 November 1942, shot on 25.12.43 at 6.55» [Bogomolov, 2014, p.94].

Noteworthy in the narrative is the presence of many war language terms (*platoon; combat guard; headquarters*; etc.) and abbreviations (*NP; NGG; GFP*) as well as the persistent verb-noun word combinations (*to cover the retreat; to provide assistance*; etc.). With the active and consistent use of these lexical units the characters' speech, as well as the narrative as a whole, becomes characterized by wartime intonation: coldness and few words, absence of emotional involvement and severity of orders, often pronounced aloud: «–The orders are to put you in the dugout, – I interrupted, – and assign a guard»; «–You tell him: if he yells and doesn't report to the fifty-first now, – the boy suddenly said resolutely and loudly, – he will be responsible...!»; «And order the sentry

not to let anyone in here or go in himself – we have no use for spies. Got it?».

As opposed to the chaos of war, Ivan's silence is characterized by promptness (the rational aspect of silence) on the one hand, and persistence (the emotional aspect of silence) on the other. Thus, in several of his replies, the style of his speech oscillates between formal and colloquial: through this manner of expression, the author portrays Ivan's childhood as an intermittent experience, whose time is subject to the laws of war time: «– So that you to go to the Suvorov school and become an officer. – No, that's later! – Protested the boy, – For now there's war – so that I always come back!» [Ibid., p.26].

Ivan is a child, but at the same time a soldier: he fondly searches for his mother and at the same time aggressively hates the Germans who took his family from him. The clash of the two sides of Ivan's personality generates silence, unlike war, which generates chaos.

Based on the analysis of the conceptual content of the image of silence, carried out on the model of L.G. Babenko, it was found that the concept under consideration is the key concept in the story, in which it is repeated with great frequency, not only directly, but also indirectly, through the use of words, phrases and expressions associated with it either by analogy or by contrast (100 occurrences). Further, considering the core of the concept, its cognitive and propositional structure, it should be noted that the position of the subject of silence is most often filled by Ivan (36): «He stood in front of me, <...> quietly sniffing»; «he was silent»; «he doesn't speak»; «For half a minute he lay in silence», etc. The remaining representations (50) are distributed unequally among the various characters of the story («Katasonov <...> stands quietly at the door and waits»; «I am silent, forgiving him what another would not», etc.) and the natural elements (13): «...one could hear the water splashing quietly under the strokes of the oars»; «Again in the stillness one could hear the measured noise of the rain».

Therefore, silence accompanies not only any actions of the characters in the novel, but also acts as a significant characteristic of the chronotope. However, as the above examples testify, working with conceptual content leads to an expanded understanding of the semantics of silence by including the difference between *silence* and *stillness/quiet*, although, as the Dictionary of Russian Mentality specifies, «unlike stillness, silence is possible only if the subject can speak» [Kolesov, 2014, 2, p.455].

In the novel the predicate of silence is expressed by different lexical units and/or their grammatical forms, appealing to the content of the concept *silence*. The most frequent is the use of verbs of speech in the negative form (31), including *talk* (12), *answer* (6), *ask* (5), *say* (5), *inform* (2) and *converse* (1), denoting either refusal to participate in communication or prohibition of communication, relating and characterizing mainly communication with Ivan (17): «He looked at me over his shoulder, but said nothing»; «He didn't speak»; « Not responding, the boy required»; «He didn't answer any questions».

The author also frequently resorts to direct naming of action *be silent* (20) and different shades of the basic meaning: «He was silent»; «He remained silent»; «He kept silent». In addition, in the story there is a frequency of adverbs (of manner or mode of action) when another action is performed (29): quietly

(21), quietly-quietly (2), silently (6): «Then, just as silently, he drank a mug of very sweet tea <...> mumbling quietly»; «For half a minute he lay silent».

The circumstantial and attributive parameters of the concept *silence* characterize it in three ways: manner of manifestation, cause and effect. Throughout the narrative, Ivan's silence is associated with his hostile attitude, verbalized by a number of words, such as *wary* (6), *concentrated* (6), *furtive* (4), *aloof* (3): «He stood in front of me, looking furtively, wary and aloof, quietly sniffing his nose, and all trembling»; «He was silent, furtively, concentrated»; «Looking at me coldly and aloof, he turned away and was silent». The reason for Ivan's obstinate silence is explained by Galtsev, the narrator, already at the end of the first chapter of the novel, which also contributes to an understanding of the boy's behaviour: «He did not answer questions, <...> as is known, scouts have their secrets that even senior officers are not available» [Bogomolov, 2019, p. 18]. The analysis of lexical units that represent the concept revealed that the author depicts the dynamics of the consequences of Ivan's silence in the reactions of other characters in the story. At first, his refusal to answer the questions posed to him is perceived with irritation and distrust. Even Ivan's rare words about how he swam across the river, no one seems to believe: «– From the other side? – I did not believe it. – So how did you get here? How can you prove that you are from the other side?» [Ibid., p. 10]; «He says! – Maslov mocked, – On a magic carpet? He tells you fairy tales, and you hanging on his words» [Ibid. p.12].

However, when later it turns out that Ivan is not a liar, his silence causes Galtsev a mixture of guilt, admiration and desire to take care of the poor boy deprived of his childhood: «I felt guilty before him <...> Now I was ready to take care of him like a nurse»; «I even wanted to wash him myself, but I did not dare» [Ibid., p.18].

The «immediate periphery» of the concept are figurative nominations of silence and cognitive features, conjugated with other mental entities, mental spaces [Babenko, 2009, p.65]. Dictionary definitions of the noun *silence* fix the idea of silence, first, as the absence of sounds, noise; second, as the absence of conversations; third, mental calmness, peace; fourth, the absence of hostility, quarrels, confrontations. However, the basic definition of silence also has an expanded linguocultural understanding: «indefinite anxiety», a sense of danger, and a symbol of death [Kolesov, 2014, 2, p.382]. In turn, the linguistic and cultural definition of silence implies «a special response to a challenge», an expression of various feelings, a symbol of wisdom, maturity and strength [Ibid., p.455]. All meanings are realized in Bogomolov's novel, consistently characterizing the character's storyline (danger and probability of death) and the inner content of Ivan's image, which is characterized by unchild-like strength, maturity and wisdom. Ivan stubbornly resists provocations, the insistence of those who interrogate him, he is a scout and knows that he must follow the rules of his position, even at the cost of losing his life: «– You do not scare me, – you are still young! You will not be able to play the silent game with me!»; «He did not answer the questions, undoubtedly acting in accordance with the instructions»; «At detention the unknown <...> showed fierce resistance <...> shot on 25.12.43 at 6.55».

On the other hand, the analysis of the «further periphery» of the concept,

the mental essence, formed by emotional and evaluative and subjective-modal meanings [Babenko, 2009, p.66], highlights another meaning of the silence of the protagonist, associated with his state of mind and personal experience. Throughout the novel, Ivan is attributed only a few replies (80), most of which consist of a small number of dry, lapidary words. The author effectively concretizes the main character's silence with the above-mentioned linguistic devices. Ivan's adult behaviour is repeatedly remarked upon by his entourage with surprise («The boy's face again shows an expression of unchild-like concentration and inner tension»; «he was just a child, <...> though judging by his face, sullen and childishly concentrated, with wrinkles on his distinguished forehead, one might have given him the figure of thirteen») and also with some pity for him, because in their eyes it is an obvious sign of sadness, suffering, unhappiness: «Wonderful kid! <...> He has so much hate in his soul!»; «He has gone through so much that we never dreamt of, <...> I never thought that a child could hate so much...»; «Hate has not boiled over in him. And there is no rest for him...».

Occasionally, however, Ivan reveals himself in unintentional memories, desires, and dreams. It is in such moments that his inner emotional world reveals itself vividly, harshly, sometimes almost violently: «– Little? Were you in a death camp? – he suddenly asks»; «...his eyes flash with fierce, unchildish hatred <...>; You...you know nothing and stay out of it!»; «How did you leave?! <...> You could have dropped by. He is also a friend..." says the boy angrily and agitatedly. He is really upset»; «No. I have no relatives. One mother. And I don't know where she is now... – His voice trembles».

On the basis of the analysed material we conclude that silence is figuratively associated with the conceptual metaphor of protection from pain: Ivan is silent not only to protect himself from his own feelings, but also to protect his loved ones from the evil and hatred that fill him due to the deep pain of the death of his family at the hands of the Nazis.

The analysis of the contexts of verbalization of this concept, revealing the author's individual ideas about silence, allowed us to substantiate the boundaries and content of the conceptual field *silence* in the novel of V.O. Bogomolov. First of all, the cognitive and propositional structure, including the position of the subject, the position of the cause and purpose, as well as temporal and locutionary parameters, forms the core of the studied concept, which can be presented as an existential state of special objective-subjective motivation under certain circumstances. Figurative nominations belong to the immediate periphery of the field, and subjective-modal meanings, in turn, belong to the further periphery. However, it should be emphasized that this structure appears as such in relation to a particular author, but it may appear quite differently in the works of other authors. Thus, such analysis also allows to decode the individual-author picture of the world, according to V.V. Vinogradov, the image of the author, «the expression of the personality of the artist in his creation» [Vinogradov, 1971, p.108], and expand the understanding of the literary text itself.

SOURCES

Bogomolov, V.O., 2019. *Ivan [Ivan]*. Moscow: Detskaya literatura Publ. (in Russian).

REFERENCES

- Babenko, L.G., 2009. *Lingvisticheskiy analiz khudozhestvennogo teksta. Teoriya i praktika: uchebnyy; praktikum [Linguistic Analysis of a Fictional Text. Theory and Practice: A Textbook; a Workshop]*. Moscow: Flinta-Nauka Publ. (in Russian).
- Eco, U., 2002. *Sei passeggiate nei boschi narrativi [Six Walks in the Literary Forests]*. Milan: La nave di Teseo. (in Italian).
- Gusev, V., 1975. Pamyat' i bol' serdets: "...iskusstvo "bezyskustvennogo" Bogomolova" [Memory and Pain of Hearts: "...Bogomolov's Art of the 'Art-less'"]. *Novy Mir*, 9, pp.256–258. (in Russian).
- Kolesov, V.V., Kolesova, D.V., Kharitonov, A.A., 2014. *Slovar' russkoi mental'nosti [Dictionary of Russian Mentality]*. In 2 Vol. Vol. 2, P – JA. St. Petersburg: Zlatoust Publ. (in Russian).
- Potebnya, A.A., 1976. *Estetika i poetika [Aesthetics and poetics]*. Moscow: Iskusstvo Publ. (in Russian).
- Slyusareva, N.A., 1982. *Aspekty obshchei i chastnoi lingvisticheskoi teorii teksta [Aspects of General and Private Linguistic Theory of the Text]*. Moscow: Nauka Publ. (in Russian).
- Valgina, N.S., 2003. *Teoriya teksta: uchebnoe posobie [Theory of Text: A Textbook]*. Moscow: Logos Publ. (in Russian).
- Vinogradov, V.V., 1971. *O teorii khudozhestvennoi rechi [On the Theory of Artistic Speech]*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola Publ. (in Russian).
- Zemskaya, Yu.N., 2010. *Teoriya teksta: uchebnoe posobie [Theory of Text: A Textbook]*. Moscow: Flinta-Nauka Publ. (in Russian).

ИСТОЧНИКИ

Богомолов, В.О., 2019. *Иван*. Москва: Детская литература.

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

- Бабенко, Л.Г., 2009. *Лингвистический анализ художественного текста. Теория и практика: учебник; практикум*. Москва: Флинта-Наука.
- Eco, U., 2002. *Sei passeggiate nei boschi narrativi*. Milano: La nave di Teseo.
- Гусев, В., 1975. Память и боль сердец: «...искусство "безыскусственного" Богомолова». *Новый мир*, 9, сс.256-258.
- Колесов, В.В., Колесова, Д.В., Харитонов, А.А., 2014. *Словарь русской ментальности. В 2-х тт. Т. 2, П – Я*. Санкт-Петербург: Златоуст.
- Потебня, А.А., 1976. *Эстетика и поэтика*. Москва: Искусство.
- Слюсарева, Н.А., 1982. *Аспекты общей и частной лингвистической теории текста*. Москва: Наука.
- Валгина, Н.С., 2003. *Теория текста: учебное пособие*. Москва: Логос.
- Виноградов, В.В., 1971. *О теории художественной речи*. Москва: Высшая школа.
- Земская, Ю.Н., 2010. *Теория текста: учебное пособие*. Москва: Флинта-Наука.

**«ԼՈՒՌԻԹՅՈՒՆ» ԿՈՆՑԵՊՏԻ ԼԵԶԿԱԶԱՍԿԱՑԱԿԱՆ ՄԻՋՈՑՆԵՐԸ
Վ. ԲՈԳՈՍՈԼՈՎԻ «ԻՎԱՆ» ՎԻՊԱԿՈՒՄ**

ԿԱՄԻԼԱ ԼԻԿԱՐԻ

Ամփոփում: Հոդվածում ուսումնասիրվում են «լռություն» հասկացության բառային և ոչ բառային արտահայտումները և դրանց ճանաչողական ու դատողական կառուցվածքը գրական ստեղծագործության համատեքստում: Հետազոտությունը հիմնված է Վլադիմիր Բոգոմոլովի «Իվան» (1957) վիպակի վրա և նպատակ ունի վերծանել «լռություն» հասկացության հիմքում ընկած ընդհանուր լեզվական շերտը և բացահայտել այդ հասկացության օբյեկտիվացման հեղինակային լեզվական միջոցները:

Գրական տեքստին բնորոշ պրագմատիկ արտահայտչական և գեղագիտական հնարքներով հեղինակը պատմում է մի առեղծվածային պատմություն գետի ափին հայտնաբերված տասներկուամյա Իվանի մասին, որին ձերբակալել էին լրտեսության կասկածով: Օգտագործելով լռության փոխաբերությունը՝ հեղինակը ներկայացնում է մանկությունից զրկված տղայի պատմությունը, որն իր մանկությունը քնքշորեն պահպանում է իր լռությամբ:

Հոդվածը անդրադառնում է լռության հասկացությունն արտահայտող տարատեսակ լեզվական միջոցներին, ինչը հնարավորություն է տալիս ներկայացնելու լռության հասկացությունը որպես իմաստային դաշտ, որի միջուկն է ճանաչողական-դատողական ընդհանրացված կառուցվածքը: Փոխաբերական-պատկերային իմաստները ձևավորում են հասկացության անմիջական ծայրամասը, մինչդեռ սուբյեկտիվ-մոդալ իմաստները կազմում են դրա հեռավոր ծայրամասը:

Նման վերլուծությունը հնարավորություն է բացահայտելու դիտարկվող հայեցակարգի գործառույթները և, հետևաբար, մեկնաբանելու հեղինակի աշխարհի անհատական պատկերը և ընդլայնելու պատմողական տեքստի ըմբռնումը:

Բանալի բառեր – *լեզվաբանական վերլուծություն, հասկացական վերլուծություն, գրական տեքստի վերլուծություն, հասկացություն, լռություն, Վլադիմիր Բոգոմոլով, ռուս գրականություն*