

УДК 82.091

Надія Денисюк, Тетяна Савчин

### HISTORICAL AND FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE CONCEPT “FICTION” AND ITS TERMINOLOGICAL EXPRESSION



*In the article*, the issue of identifying the patterns of formation of concept “fictional (art) world” is analysed as well as the peculiarities of its conceptual-terminological expressions in Ukrainian and English literary criticism.

*Key words:* fiction, concept, translation, terminology, term, literary criticism.



The issue of identifying the principles of formation of concept “fictional (art) world” and the peculiarities of its conceptual-terminological expressions in Ukrainian and English literary criticism is reviewed in line with the phenomenological methodology, which external manifestations coincide with the traditional in philology etymological excursions into the field of lexicography and terminology. In this case, the historically formed basic requirements for the term are taken into account and now considered the axioms. The authors of “Fundamentals of Terminology” (2000) summarize these requirements as follows: “1. The term should conform to the rules and norms of the language. 2. The term should be regular. 3. The term should be definitive. That is, each term precisely associates with the definition that focuses on the appropriate concept. 4. The term can be relatively independent of context. 5. The term should be accurate, although in sublanguages numerous “false oriented” (D. S. Lotte) units occur. 6. The term should be short, although this requirement is often contrary to the requirement of accuracy, that is, the completeness of the term” [4, p.12]. However, while considering the requirement of “the terminiqueness”, the authors add a significant caveat that uniqueness “should be achieved within one terminological sphere” because at some sublanguages the polysemy of terms is a common phenomenon [ibid].

The above characteristics of the term mainly relate to *en vir* on mental sciences and technology. Polysemy of terms prevents mutual understanding between the professional speakers and the users of scientific results. It is not always easy to separate the terms from the professional vocabulary and clearly distinguish them from the nomenclature items. The above authors emphasize, that “the terms are not special words, but only words in special functions” [4, p.15]. The refore, the issues of functional-semantic distinction of professional names, nomenclature items, and terms “do not belong to the competence of linguistic *sin general*”, they are solved, except spelling aspects, “exclusively by experts of science and technology” [ibid].

The translators (interpreters) and translations of foreign texts play a peculiar role in enriching the terminological systems. If the target language “lacks the necessary lexical units, it is the translator who creates an appropriate lexical equivalent in the target language when he/she encounters gaps” [4, p. 18]. In such a case, they have to solve the problem in dependently: how “to combine the national traditions with positive international experience more effectively” [4, p. 19]. It is of a great importance especially in period of total modernization of national terminological systems and their classification according to the fields of science, and in time of changes of socio-political status of the nation and the state system. Then the motivation of lexical units gains its significance [4, p. 74–87]. The issue of motivation of lexical units offered by the author or translator of scientific concepts is solved taking into account the

relationship between the inner form of a word, its lexical meaning and origin (etymology). Modern linguists continue discussions on these issues [4, p.63–69, p. 103–112], as it is possible to use motivation without etymology, or vice versa, to use etymology without motivation. The specific method of filling gaps in sectorial terminological systems depends on the socio-cultural situation. “Sometimes a language community, – the authors of “Fundamentals of Terminology” underline, – wants to express the concept for which there is no corresponding word in a given language. In such case, the language either borrows the correct word from another language, or create a new one. So, it is possible to borrow simultaneously the form and meaning of a word, or the meaning only <...> Thus, the new terms can be created either by direct borrowing, or through national resources only, or by combined methods ...” [4, p.103]. Then the direct borrowing of terminological elements is based solely on their etymology without motivation; in case of introduction of new terms by tracing, there is motivation without etymology. For the creating of new words, any motivation is obvious. The specialists (S. Gajda, 1990) define three types of term motivation: word-formation (morphological derivation), connective one (derivation by adding bases and communications) and semantic derivation [4, p. 104].

These and other statements of Ukrainian linguists working in the field of terminology summarize the major trends of the modern world linguistics. General linguistic conclusions shed some light on the literary terminology, but they need further explication through more thorough analysis of literary experience. The Polish literary theorist J. Slawinski in the article “Issues of Literary Terminology” [20, p.184–199] explained his point of view on this issue, taking into account the difficulties that had arisen during the creation of the dictionary of literary terms [18]. He noted that “the reflection on terminology is always - and it cannot be otherwise – the reflection on the basic features of the language of correspondent discipline due to which it can effectively dominate in a certain area of knowledge” [20, p.184].

The first publication of this article appeared in 1968, it is included in the second volume of “Selected Works” by J. Slawinski without any changes (1998). The scientist is well known due to his main thesis: “Literature, when viewed through the prism of terminology tools used by researchers, is considered a discipline that has not crossed the threshold of its methodological awareness. The semantic units of undetermined status compose the main part of the standard science vocabulary on the literature...” [20, p. 188]. Besides, the popular since antiquity and the classical era nomenclature units existing in the poetics and rhetoric, the philosophical categories, general conceptions and concepts concerning literature, language and culture are used in this sphere. The situation is complicated by the fact that the “literary practice is not limited to the following research operations as description, classification, interpretation, but always largely propagates ideals and values” [20, p. 197]. Therefore, the ideological bias and pragmatic focus of representatives of many artistic trends, philosophical concepts, aesthetic doctrine, theoretical and literary schools is perceived in the meanings of the notions and semantics of the relevant terms. All that mentioned above must be taken into account by the creators of literary terms. In this regard, the lexicographers rarely undertake such work.

The difficulties in creating the vocabularies in the humanities (especially aesthetics, literature, culture) were discussed numerous times by the scientists of our country who had to take care of the defence of “purity of Marxist-Leninist doctrine”. Here is a typical example of the preface to “Brief Dictionary on Aesthetics” appeared in 1983, edited by Prof. M. Ovsyannikov: “The scientific community has repeatedly discussed the issue of regulating terms and concepts in literary criticism and aesthetics, as conceptual and terminological inaccuracy prevents the development of these sciences. Scientists were unanimous that the problems of reorganizing the terminology used in the study of art are very important for the development of sciences on literature and art;

and that it is time to do this seriously, and to organize systematic work” [5, p. 3]. These problems remain unfulfilled not mainly because of ideological or organizational reasons, but primarily of the theoretical and methodological ones.

These reasons are always mentioned when there is a need for any systematization in aesthetics and literary criticism. This fact can be illustrated by an other example that is close to our issue, which has to be considered a crucial period of spiritual life, in time of smart reorientations. Namely, this is an article of the famous philosopher and aesthetics V. Asmus, who studied literary criticism in the 20<sup>th</sup> of the last century. In the article “The Protection of Fiction. Literature of Fact and Facts of Literature” (1929), the author wrote: “Reevaluation in the arts has long been coming fast pace. It covers a large range of issues varying from wide, heavy and delicate ones concerning the meaning, value, and feasibility of existence of art in general, and ending the speculative problems of the individual forms and elements. <...> Current debates about art, even when they relate to specific matters, issued a whole series of fundamental problems. Such historical period has no random or minor problems. Even peripheral consideration of the smallest issue immediately causes – because of dialectical law of interdependence – posing the most acute problems of primary importance” [1, p. 12]. This statement does not only explain the complexity of the system presentation of observations on the nature of art expression, but also shows how in theoretical reflections on fiction the important philosophical and aesthetic, psychological and semantic and linguistic issues concentrate; they are updated due to the practical needs and in concrete historical situation. V. Asmus concluded the chapeau in such words: “In the current theoretical and critical literature on issues of art, always and again there is a dispute about the cultural value of **fiction** (emphasis added by the authors), about the value that in the current situation (1929 – authors) the fiction can have **as a special category and a special element of fictional works**” (emphasis added by the authors) [ibid]. It should be noted that this fiction is treated here primarily as a special category. Now another reasoning of Russian literary critic V. Novikov should be considered, who developed the problem of “fictional truth”. In 1974, this scientist wrote: “Debates on the problem of true depiction of reality are strongly controversial, and this fact is not accident. When we start talking about fictional truth, we involuntarily confront with the entire amount of issues related to a particular form of knowledge inherent in the art and those regularities, which characterize the interaction of art with reality and determine its social function. The way the theorist or artist responds these issues related to the overall understanding of art, depends on his/her understanding of fictional truth” [8, p.7]. The Soviet theoretician immediately noted two alternative approaches to understanding the problem: some consider the fictional truth as an organic feature of realistic art and opposite to the modernism. Others, however, interpret the fictional truth too narrow, reducing it to “the truth of fact”, “documentary”, and “reliability”, and bring the nonfiction genres to the high level because they lack fiction. Moreover, V. Novikov added: “I’m not talking about the widespread in the West view that refuses the art in all cognitive functions and denies the notion of fictional truth” [8, p.8]. So, in the works of Asmus (1929) and Novikov (1974) the similar understanding of concepts “fiction” and “fictional truth” can be traced. The basis of this logic is the opposition of “dialectical materialistic” and “idealistic-subjectivist” methodologies. Therefore, we penetrate the famous “hermeneutic circle”. To understand the lexical meaning of the word “fiction” and the phrase “fictional truth” as equivalents to “fiction”, one must know the intellectual context and methodological principles that enabled the sense-creating processes and word-building capacity of our predecessors. Moreover, to penetrate the hidden and distant from us spiritual (cognitive-creative) processes, we should follow the verbalization of relevant texts created for us in our native language or translated from the originals or intermediate language. It turns out that lexical item “fiction” is not alien to Ukrainian

language, but has long been and remains on the periphery of the vocabulary without fixed semantic status in Ukrainian terminology. This fact is proved by the texts of the authors of poetic sandrhetoric of XVII–XVIII centuries as well as by the researches dedicated to the setexts (G. Syvokin', I. Ivanio, V. Masliuk, J. Ushkalov). In this case, the terminological system of literary-critical works of Ivan Franko should be mentioned, which was commented by S. Pinchuk and Y. Rehushevskiyi. In our further researches, we'll try to reveal the chronology of "fiction" in the Ukrainian texts and the original timeline and the vicissitudes of their later perception (translation, commentary, interpretation).

### Literature

1. *Асмус В. Ф.* Вопросы теории и истории эстетики / В. Ф. Асмус. – М.: Искусство, 1968. – С. 11–36.
2. *Білецький Л.* Основи української літературно-наукової критики / Л. Білецький. – К: Либідь, 1998. – 408 с.
3. *Гундорова Т.* Проявлення слова. Дискурс раннього українського модернізму. Постмодерна інтерпретація / Т. Гундорова. – Львів: Літопис, 1997. – 297 с.
4. *Дяков А. С.* Основи термінотворення: Семантичні та соціолінгвістичні аспекти / А. С. Дяков, Т. Р. Кияк, З. Б. Куделько. – К.: ВД "КМАcademia", 2000. – 218 с.
5. *Краткий словарь по эстетике.* Книга для учителя. – М.: Просвещение, 1983. – С. 119–120.
6. *Літературознавчий словник-довідник* / Р. Т. Гром'як, Ю. І. Ковалів та ін. – Київ: ВЦ "Академія", 1997. – 752 с.
7. *Лук'янець В. С.* Сучасний науковий дискурс: оновлення методологічної культури / В. С. Лук'янець, О. М. Кравченко, Л. В. Озадовська. – К.: Інститут філософії НАН України. – 304 с.
8. *Новиков В.* Художественная правда и диалектика творчества. – М.: Сов. писатель, 1974. – 520 с.
9. *Пінчук С. П.* Словник літературознавчих термінів Івана Франка / С. П. Пінчук, Є. С. Регушевський. – К.: Наукова думка, 1966. – 272 с.
10. *Сивокінь Г.* Давні українські поетики. Друге вид. з додатками / Г. Сивокінь. – Харків: Акта, 2000. – 165 с.
11. *Словник української мови:* В 11 томах. / Під ред. І. К. Білодіда. – Київ: Наукова думка. – Т. 10. – 1979. – 658 с.; Т. 11. – 1980. – 699 с.
12. *Торкут Н. М.* Проблеми генези і структурування жанрової системи англійської прози пізнього ренесансу (малі епічні форми та "література факту") / Н. М. Торкут. – Запоріжжя: ЗДУ, 2000. – 406 с.
13. *Ушкалов Л.* Світ українського барокко / Л. Ушкалов. – Харків: Око. 1994. – 112 с.
14. *Философская энциклопедия:* В 5 томах. – Т. 5. – М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 1970. – 740 с.
15. *Франко І.* Зібрання творів: У 50-ти томах / І. Франко. – К.: Наукова думка. – Т. 28. – 1980. – С. 176–195; Т. 30. – 1981. – С. 214–218; Т. 31. – 1981. – С. 46; Т. 39. – 1983. – С. 7–20.
16. *Abrams M. H.* The Glossary of Literary Terms / M. H. Abrams. – Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1985. – 336 p.
17. *Barnet S.* A Dictionary of Literary Terms / S. Barnet, N. Berman, W. Burto. – Boston. – Toronto, 1960. – 96 p.
18. *Glowinski M.* Słownik terminów literackich / M. Glowinski, T. Kostkiewiczowa, A. Okopieh-Slawinska, J. Slawinski / Pod red. J. Slawinskiego. Wyd. 3. – Wyd-wo im. Ossolinskich, 1998. – 706 s.
19. *Lamarque P.* Truth, Fiction, and Literature. A Philosophical Perspective / P. Lamarque, S. Olsen. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994. – 481 p.
20. *Slawinski J.* Prace wybrane / J. Slawinski. – Т. 2. – Krakow: Universitas, 1998. – 245 s.
21. *The Idea of Literature: The Foundations of English Criticism.* – Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1979. – 413 p.
22. *Trilling L.* The experience of Literature. Fiction. A Reader with Commentaries / L. Trilling. – NY.: Columbia University, 1967. – 387 p.

**Надія Денисюк, Тетяна Савчин**

### ІСТОРИЧНИЙ І ФУНКЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ АНАЛІЗ "БЕЛЕТРИСТИКИ" ПОНЯТТЯ І ЙОГО ТЕРМІНОЛОГІЧНОГО ВИРАЖЕННЯ

У статті висвітлюється проблема вивчення закономірностей становлення концепту "художній (мистецький) світ" та особливостей його поняттєво-термінологічного вираження в українському та англійському літературознавстві.

*Ключові слова:* художній світ, переклад, концепт, термінологія, термін, літературознавство.

Надежда Денисюк, Татьяна Савчин

**ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЙ И ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ “БЕЛЛЕТРИСТИКИ”  
ПОНЯТИЯ И ЕГО ТЕРМИНОЛОГИЧЕСКОГО ВЫРАЖЕНИЯ**

*В статье* освещается проблема изучения закономерностей становления концепта “художественный мир” и особенностей его понятийно-терминологического выражения в украинском и англоязычном литературоведении.

*Ключевые слова:* художественный мир, перевод, терминология, термин, литературоведение.