

Yuri Rozhdestvensky on Semiotics of Literature and Modern Literary Process

This paper was presented by Olga E. Hazanova, Ph.D. in Linguistics, Associate Professor of Moscow State Lomonosov University and Moscow State Pedagogical University, Russia,

A Presentation at the Conference: ‘Russian Evolution: Russian Reflections’ on the work of Professor Yuri Rozhdestvensky: his Contribution to Linguistics, Rhetoric, Communication Theory, Semiotics, Poetics and Narratology

University of London, 21st October, 2017

Yuri Rozhdestvensky (1926-1999)

- A prominent Russian philologist, sinologist, philosopher of culture and educationist;
- Honourable Professor of Moscow State Lomonosov University
- Head of the Department of General and Comparative Linguistics, Moscow State Lomonosov University, for 25 years;
- Full member of the Academy of Pedagogic Science, USSR, RF;
- Lomonosov Award for developing language theory for post-industrial, information-technology society (Moscow, 1995);
- Grimm Award for the contribution to German philology (Berlin, 1985).
- Published about 120 works including 12 monographies on general linguistics, linguistics typology, general philology, communication theory and rhetoric, philosophy of culture, philosophy of education;
- Since 1970s, developed and delivered the university discipline “General Philology” aimed at studying speech technologies in the historic and cultural perspective and their effects on modern society;

- Directed about 150 Ph.D. theses of his students from Russia, ex-Soviet states, Europe, US, China.

In my paper I will attempt to synthesize the views of Yuri Rozhdestvensky on literature and poetic language as they are introduced in his monographies ‘General Philology’ (1979, 1996), ‘Theory of Rhetoric’ (1997), ‘Principles of Modern Rhetoric’ (1999) and ‘Introduction to Culture Studies’ (1996).

The aspects that interested Rozhdestvensky most about literature are as follows:

- Literary texts among texts of other genres (folklore, scientific, legal, documents, etc.): their inner structure and rules of circulation in society;
- ‘Writer-reader’ relations and ‘the image of the author’ as their core;
- Semiotics of literature as being conditioned by national literary canons, poetics and literary theories;
- Literary texts at different historic stages of language development – the oral, written, printed stages and mass communication: in terms of those changes that new speech technologies bring to literary discourse;
- Literary criticism and literary theory depending on a historic stage of language development.

It is important to realize that in Russia, since the end of the 19th c., discussions about nature of literature and approaches to literary analysis have been led within two major theoretical and methodological paradigms – one built by Alexander Potebnya (1835-1891) and the other created by Formal school to which Victor Vinogradov, Yuri Rozhdestvensky’s teacher, linked to by his early works (his article about the style of the medieval Russian text ‘The Life of Protopope Abbacum’ and some others).

Both methods, Potebnian and that of formalists, grounded their literary studies on the interpretation of language functions and specifically the aesthetic function of

language as in works of literature language is used in its aesthetic function (a general assumption). Proceeding from their interpretation of the aesthetic function of language, they produced distinct definitions of poetry and its language. Potebnya interpreted poetic language as the one more easily accessible for readers than prosaic due to its metaphorical shape, for metaphors facilitate the process of understanding, elucidate hidden meanings of words, which leads to aesthetic pleasure in readers. While formalists (V. Schklovsky, R. Jakobson, E. Polivanov, B. Eihenbaum, Y. Tynianov, L. Yakubinsky and others), on the contrary, interpreted poetic language as ‘dark’, ‘impeded’, requiring intellectual, creative efforts on readers’ part and thus exposing them to aesthetic pleasure.

A few pages that follow present a dialogue of ideas on the aesthetic function of language and literary discourse within the Russian literary context of the 20th c. – a dialogue between Potebnya, formalists, Vinogradov and Rozhdestvensky – to be further used as a background for Yuri Rozhdestvensky’s approach to poetic language and semiotics of literature.

In the second half of the 19th c., it was Alexander Potebnya and his proponents who stated that the aesthetic function of language expressed itself in works of literature, and called the aesthetic function of language the leading one, while all the other functions were treated as the subordinate.

Potebnya was particularly interested in the relations between language, thought and reality. Language for him is primarily the means by which the mind puts in order the influx of outer impressions and stimuli. Words carry not only some meaning, but also the past experience of an individual and a nation too, through which all new experiences are filtered (here one can hear the echo of Humboldt’s ideas, his concept of *national Geist*). According to Potebnya, a word has three aspects: the external form; the meaning; the internal form. It is through the ‘internal form’ of a word that the objective world is subjectivized. In many cases the internal form is rooted in myth and, hence, acts as a bridge between language and folklore (with its symbols). Therefore, the more transparent the internal form of a word is at the

current stage of language development, the higher the aesthetic value of this word is [10].

That is to say, ‘the internal form of the word’ is the word’s immediate etymological meaning of which native speakers are aware of. According to Potebnya, literature, specifically poetry, aims at revealing the internal forms of words (examples offered by Potebnya: ‘*Сокровище мое, куда сокрылось ты?*’; ‘*Вешается на шею женатому, ух, повеса, право, повеса*’. An example from Shakespeare can be: Antony calls Brutus’s followers ‘*brutish beasts*’ – the internal form reveals the traitors’ nature that they share). Provided that the internal form of a word is ‘awaken’ (Potebnya’s term) by poets and writers, it is the language of literature that fully embodies the aesthetic function of the language.

In ‘General Philology’, Rozhdestvensky writes about Potebnya:

‘The first synthesis of poetics and linguistics was implemented in works by Potebnya. Considering the linguopsychological mechanism of word development, Potebnya discovered that the so called ‘internal form of the word’, this very mechanism based on the laws of psychological association, always included poetic tropes: a metaphor, a metonymy, a synecdoche. Thus poetic tropes were explained as a structural part of the mechanism of language development. Considered as language anatomic units, all linguistic aspects in language appeared to be combined with poetic units as elements of functioning language, as elements of its physiology. It was how the concept of linguistic poetics was formed which became almost universally spread, often without any reference to its author. According to the concept of linguistic poetics, development of language comes as an endless number of poetic usage of a word; in this line any new usage of word is its new poetic application.’ [12, p.270]

According to Potebnya, the aesthetic function of language is manifested primarily in imaginative texts, so the boundaries of verbal art grow wider: they embrace folklore genres (as being rooted in image thinking) and fiction. Here we arrive at the central point of Potebnian approach to texts classification – the question of an utmost importance for Rozhdestvensky and interpreted by him very differently from Potebnya. The latter put folklore and literature in one class called by him

‘poetry’ and contrasted it with all the other text genres – ‘prose’, inferior to ‘poetry’ and regarded as language decline. The aesthetic function of language subdues its other functions. On the contrary, Rozhdestvensky identifies sources of language development in both prosaic and poetic texts, while seeing resources for social development in thorough investigation of all text genres, their successful management and thus achieving a most effective balance of various speech genres in lives of individuals and the society on the whole. [15]

Vinogradov having paid tribute to Potebnya’s theory of poetic language at the same time wrote in his book ‘On Theory of Artistic Speech’ («О теории художественной речи»):

‘Considering poetry as a form of live creative cognition of the world, A.A. Potebnya paid more attention to the understanding and interpretation of cognitive value of facts of poetic language and was silent about their expressive-emotional value. However, expressive-emotional aspect of style of a literary work should play a very important role in characterization of the poetic suggestibility’. [19, p.12]

Formalists’ definitions of poetic language were thoroughly analyzed in Vinogradov’s book “On Theory of Artistic Speech”, too:

‘It is exactly here, in the first place, that in 1910-20s, as a philological echo of futurism, on the basis of straightforward opposition of poetic language to practical language, the two formulas were established – vague and without live constructive linguistic meaning: “Poetic language is the language aimed at expression” and “Poetry is language in its aesthetic function”. In fact, the same formulas received later in the works of American philologists, especially, those by prof. R. Jakobson, broader, but even less clear expression: “... poetry can and should be regarded as the language organized in a special way”... Definition of poetry offered by prof. R. Jakobson is, in fact, simply contradictive and insufficient in essence... It blends and equates two absolutely different notions of *language*: language as material of art and language as an aesthetically altered form of art, as manifestation of poetic creative cognition. The notion of a ‘specific organization’ does not really matter here. The most important is to decide in what conditions and due to which of its characteristics word (language) becomes a factor of aesthetic-reflective and expressive-emotional realization and a manifestation of artistic reality, artistic world... In prof. Jakobson’s formula nothing is said about the language of verbal art as a form of creative cognition of the world...’ [19, p.10-12,37]

In the quote Vinogradov refers to the following works of R. Jakobson: 1/Jacobson, R. *The Latest Russian Poetry. First Outline* (Viktor Khlebnikov). Prague, 1921. [4, p.11]; 2/Jacobson, R. *Style in Language*. N.Y. 1960. [5, p. 350-377]. Despite this sharp criticism, researchers, in Vinogradov's lifetime (V.Grigroriev) and nowadays, keep finding a certain affinity between his and Jacobson's concepts of poetic language. [19, p.37]

The opposing views of Potebnya and formalists on the nature of poetic language were summarized by a Russian philologist G.Vinokur: formalists 'denied any 'inner form' and thus separated 'poetic language' and 'practical language', while Potebnya considered 'any word to be poetic and thus turned art into something more real than reality itself.' [21, p.388-393]

Drawing upon his predecessors' and teacher's approaches, Yuri Rozhdestvensky built his own theory of texts with distinct structural dominants and focuses. One of these dominants is that he describes any single text genre as being juxtaposed with all other text genres on the grounds of their individual semiotic nature and their modes of social existence. And he does this from both historic and modern perspective, and for different cultural regions, too. [12, p.19-26].

Seeking to describe the juxtaposition of literary texts with those non-literary, Rozhdestvensky shows that there is no direct and unambiguous correlation between the aesthetic function of language and the way language is used in works of literature. Considering the links between language and other semiotic systems, Rozhdestvensky states that the aesthetic aspect of language is broader (and, at the same time, narrower) than its use in literary discourse. [13]

The chart below comes from Rozhdestvensky's book 'Introduction to Culture Studies', and reflects the system of sign-making that determines establishing a man as a social being. [13, p. 34, 35]

1. LANGUAGE			
3.RITES	11. utensils 12. costume 13. architecture	10.fine art 9. dance 8. music	4.GAMES
	14.measures 15. orientation signs 16. commands	7. fortune-telling 6. omens 5. superstitions	
2. MEANS OF COUNTING			

Without this constellation of the 16 semiotic systems, human society would have never existed. Rozhdestvensky divides the groups of signs into two types – those consolidating and specialized. Consolidating semiotic systems are compulsory for everyone – they are # 1, 2, 3 and 4 on the chart.

The consolidating role of Language, in particular, is clearly seen when we take into consideration the fact that texts created by means of language belong to all classes of semiotic systems and thus language mediates among all semiotic systems by prescribing their signs.

In his lectures, Rozhdestvensky stated that the aesthetic function of language correlates with different semiotic systems in different ways. Let me illustrate his idea. For instance the language used by mathematicians for writing their academic papers, in terms of aesthetics, is supposed to be arranged rationally and precisely, and, more important, be able to express mathematical concepts that emerge due to a specific type of imagination inherent to mathematical thinking.

While observing language in games (semiotic system # 4), we distinguish a class of verbal games, like tongue twisters, riddles and some others in oral tradition. And

crosswords, chainwords, palindrome, acrostic, other word puzzles – in written language. Here the language usage aims at developing our linguistic abilities, helps us to master the language, and thus triggers a special aesthetic emotion on the background of our excitement and competitive behavior in verbal games (we compete with language itself).

The core of rites (semiotic system #3) is introduced in verbal formulas which are interpreted by ritual participants as signals for their transition to non-verbal actions. For example, a transition from words to offering, from words to hunting, etc. Those creating rites usually care a lot about beautiful use of speech; thus, here again we face aesthetic treatment of language. However, the meaning of a ritual cannot be reduced to the aesthetic function of words; its purpose – a person's spiritual and physical transfiguration.

Language is used aesthetically for the prognostic purpose (semiotic systems # 6 and 7) in fortune-telling, and prophecies, when texts are supposed to be presented by means of their rhythmical, metrical, and sometimes rhymed structures. In Revelation we read: “And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder: and I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps” [2, 14:2]. We cannot but admire the beauty of the verse, its rhythm, alliteration, repetitions, gradation, parallelism – all in the two lines... However, the meaning of this prophecy by John is not to be reduced to an aesthetic demonstration.

All areas of human creative activities (literature, fine and applied arts, music, and so on) are covered by art criticism. It's only natural that critics strive to bring the language of their judgements in accord with the subject of their criticism, with what they write about. Art critics try to make their texts aesthetically appealing for their readers who are art lovers – they start right with the titles for their essays: ‘To criticize the critic’ (T.S. Elliot), ‘The Decay of Lying’, ‘The Fall and Decline of Literature’ (O. Wilde), etc. However, the purpose of critics is to analyze and maybe recommend this or that literary work.

In the sphere of managing speech (commands, warnings, arrangements) the aesthetic function of language is quite secondary. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of the managing speech depends on the art of its implementation – wording. It's rather obvious in documents, in which the form of addressing, the style of the description of the subject and even terminology imply aesthetic appreciation from documents' users. The English should feel it better than Russians, as historically English relies heavily on the language of legal documents. [7, p.139,140]

(Correlation between literary and legal discourses in the Russian context: Vinogradov, while describing 'the image of the author' referred to 'the image of the author' in lawyers' speeches made in court. In them, he discovered the roots for 'the image of the author' in literary discourse [20]. So, in the Russian context the connection between the two types of texts is poetic rather than linguistic).

Therefore, according to Rozhdestvensky, the aesthetic function of language is manifested through all genres, and it is not right to put the sign of equality between aesthetic function of language and literary discourse. Aesthetic function of language cannot be regarded as inherent purely to fiction.

On the other hand, as we can judge from our reading experience and from literary criticism, writers sometimes are quite far from using artistic potential of the language to its full (mass literature, scribblers). There is a great deal of such texts: they are part of literature according to their external characteristics, but cannot be recognized as aesthetically worthy, and their authors sometimes bluntly proclaim their disinterest in the artistic value of the texts they produce. Or the aesthetic structure of a literary work is so much special that it falls out of the general interpretation of 'the aesthetic function of language'. It happens regularly when a new aesthetics substitutes for the previous one that dominated for some time. For instance, the poetics of 'The Flowers of Evil' by Baudelaire, Dostoevsky's 'reporting' style were criticized for their 'unaesthetic' aesthetics in the time they were published.

The question of the correlation between the aesthetic function of language and literary discourse seems to be really complicated. If the aesthetic function of language reveals itself in all types of texts including those of literature, it's necessary to juxtapose literary texts with others.

Summarizing Rozhdestvensky's ideas in Chapter 5 'Printed Literature' of 'General Philology' [12], we can try to formulate a set of distinctive features of literary texts.

The first feature of a literary work is that it is a text freely selected by readers. They are attracted to a literary text not by some external compulsive acts, but exclusively by the inner merits of the piece of literature as such, which readers anticipate based on their knowledge of the writer's other works, from critical reviews, etc. [12, p.237]

Another important aspect is that the knowledge of the content of a literary text doesn't imply a direct influence on the material, practical life of people. (Although there is historical evidence of imitating literary characters' behavior: a chain of suicides among young men after reading Goethe's 'Die Leiden des jungen Werthers' (so called 'effect of Werthers'); or the romantic code of behaviour of English romanticists, who had created this code, etc. – such cases are regarded as exceptional). It means that a literary text is intended for recreation as Aristotle stated in his 'Poetics', pointing out that along with giving pleasure poetry could also teach its readers, but its didactic, instructive message was soon to be forgotten.

Yet another feature of a literary text is individual authorship because literature is organized by writers. If some writer assumes a pseudonym or tries to hide his identity, a reader, anyway, seeks to discern the thoughts and ideas of the one who speaks in the text on the writer's behalf and manifests his/her personal 'ego' (a 'conscious thinking subject' behind the text), let his ego be revealing in a complex form when the writer speaks in his character's name, constructing a Narrative and a Narrator. Tristram Shandy, Tom Sawyer or M. Zoschenko's characters are bright

examples of such writers' 'mimicry'. However, in case of Narrator, too, a literary work attracts readers, first of all, as an opinion of the particular person, the writer, and the importance of this opinion to readers determines the value of a piece of literature.

This specific characteristic of literary discourse is brightly manifested while being compared with technical literature. In scientific and technical texts an author develops his/her ideas on behalf of their field of knowledge, while readers are focused on the subject itself, not on the writer. The author's name here is significant as a scientific priority, and just in few occasions as a philosophy of the subject in question.

It means that a literary work engages readers by the writer's individual, philosophical opinion expressed in a special way – his/her individual view, not a generally valid proof. Rozhdestvensky interpreted the readers' interest to literature as an equivalent (in the written or printed form), of an intimate conversation between a writer and his reader for the dialectical purpose, that is, to come closer to the truth about the subject interesting to them both. It is exactly dialectical nature of literature that urged Bakhtin to treat literary works as parts of a dialogue between writers lasting through ages. [1]

Apparently, any dialectical talk can flow into eristic and sophistic, and then we face a writer's political tendency/engagement that weakens the artistic power of his/her writing. In such case, the intention of a literary work is not a search for the truth and beauty jointly with readers, but imposing on them some other interests.

Social tendency as an artistic principal was promoted by literary criticism of groups of the so called 'proletarian writers' (VAPP and RAPP) formed in the early 20s, soon after the revolution of 1917; also, by a number of Soviet leading critics like A. Lunacharsky, Vronsky, Tarasenkov, Beskin and others. Later the social orientation of art made the cornerstone for the doctrine of socialist realism in the USSR, the theory of *Neue Sachlichkeit* in Germany and Italian neo-realism.

Futurism as a literary technique developed a series of approaches to achieve eristic goals by means of literary works' structure. The slogan 'to equate a pen with a bayonet' by Mayakovsky was interpreted as a principle underlying the production of literary works rooted in eristic. Mayakovsky discussed this motif of 'a pen and a bayonet' in a number of his poems constructed as dialogues, polemics with other poets of his time. [9] And not only him. Tolstoi wrote in his diary: 'I woke up terrified. In my dream I served in the army, was unfaithful to my wife and writing for my own pleasure.' [17]. The latter was said by the author of "War and Peace" and "Anna Karenina"! The quotes show how painstaking it was for literary geni to make their choice between dialectic and eristic in their works.

However, the analysis of retention of literary works within the literary process, based on literary dictionaries and encyclopedias published in the course of the 20th c. (one of the parts of my Ph.D. theses), shows that eristic principles led to 'mere oblivion' of those writers who based their works purely on eristic. 'Proletarian writers', though having received full ideological support and appreciation for their works in the first encyclopedia, were not included in the next one in the 60s. They had stayed where they belonged to – in the 20-30s of the past century being 'crossed out' of the literary process.

On the contrary, poets and writers whose works were dialectically oriented, though being heavily criticized in the early encyclopedia, were retained within the literary process and could not be avoided by those compiling the second encyclopedia in 1960s. Moreover, special mechanisms were applied by new critics to 'rehabilitate' condemned writers of the first encyclopedia.

The following is the outcome of content-analysis of two entries about Osip Mandelstam, a brilliant poet of the Russian 'silver age', in Literary Encyclopedias of 1929-1939 [8] and 1962-1978 [3]:

1. Author of the entry:

- Anonymous (= introduced on behalf of the editorial board) (1932)
- A. Morozov (1967)

2. Qualification:

- ‘Poet’ (1932)
- ‘Russian Soviet poet’ (1967)

3. Literary orientation:

- ‘One of the main figures of acmeism - a bourgeois and counter-revolutionary movement’. (1932)
- ‘In 1912 comes to acmeism, but preserves the independent status which makes it difficult to understand him’. (1967)

4. Political views:

- ‘Adheres to the position of absolute social indifference – a specific form of bourgeois hostility to the socialist revolution’. (1932)
- ‘The October revolution evoked a warm response in M.’ (1967)

5. His works:

- ‘M. expressed ... fear of his class before any social changes, proclaiming stagnation of existence’. ‘M’s works is encoded ideological immortalization of capitalism and its culture...’ (1932)
- ‘Since 1912, acceptance of external reality of the world and plenty of material details characterize his poems. Since 1916, starting with an anti-militarist poem ‘Zverinets’ (‘Zoo’), M. responds more and more vividly to the today’s reality’. ‘M’s poems of 1930s say about great sincerity of M’s poetic path. The poet is seeking for the ways to the poems which our people need’. (1967)

At his literary seminars, Rozhdestvensky pointed out that the border between dialectic and eristic in a literary work is vague and is never clearly marked. This is because a literary work is constituted of monologue and dialogue. In monologue, subjective feelings of a writer are not absolutely free of his ‘interests’. Thus, the two novels by D. Defoe and J. Swift bear elements of eristic. ‘Gulliver’s Travels’, in particular, aimed at ridiculing Defoe’s ideology and his literary taste. However, the artistic power of both novels, besides some eristic principles, lies in the writers’ personal philosophical views, and their philosophy makes a subject for a dialectical conversation with their readers.

On the whole, the correlation between dialectic and eristic ways of narration is largely built on the writer’s broadmindedness and understatement of his/her views in their books – the so called position of an ‘unengaged author’. A writer can be an adherent of some social or even political idea, but the dialectic aspect and artistic

value of his work depend on his own philosophical thinking which he expresses in a particular literary form.

Besides the above mentioned features of the literary content, it is distinctive semiotic nature that marks a literary text. It means, according to Rozhdestvensky, that a reader selecting a book for reading is well aware beforehand that it is going to be a literary discourse, a piece of fiction, art, and this, in turn, implies specific relations between the writer and the reader... It is preconditioned that a writer invents an imaginative world – the one that emerges from his/her fantasy to reflect his/her philosophical views in an alluring literary form.

Literary form that provides grounds for ‘author-reader’ relations, is a product of artistic experience and has a ‘sign nature’ rooted in a literary tradition, that is a series of conventions within which literary genres develop. The first established convention of the higher level, according to Rozhdestvensky, is normative poetics.

In terms of normative poetics, there are several literary traditions. A profound (and amazing in terms of its cultural and historic perspective) comparison of oriental and western literary traditions – Mediterranean, Indian and Chinese – is given in Chapter 3 ‘Written Text Development and the Problem of Emergence of Literature’ and Chapter 4 ‘Arts of Written Speech’ of “General Philology”. Rozhdestvensky convincingly shows that the classic literary traditions are represented by distinct literary theories. A set of individual genres developed within each literary tradition, which by itself presents the first layer of conventions between writers and readers and enables readers ‘to recognize’ a literary text.

Mediterranean canons:

- Old Greek
- Latin



(Egyptian & Hebrew literature)

Oriental canons:

- Chinese, 13 books
- Buddhist (Indian & Chinese)
- Indian Veda

Rozhdestvensky points out that depending on this or that cultural region, classic literary traditions cover texts of distinct genres and focus on distinct aspects of text analysis. He writes:

“Aristotle builds his theory of poetic speech, theory of mimesis, on the satisfaction experienced by a man as a result of cognition. And the one who cognizes is in the first place a listener or spectator. On this grounds Aristotle gives a number of technical recommendations to enable poets with regard to previous experience create their works satisfying their audience’s interest with aesthetic means of poetry”. [12, 192]

According to Rozhdestvensky, the Chinese literary theory suggests a very different approach. Chinese literature is built on systematization of all existing texts (‘slovesnost’), first, and then proceeds to works of literature, their thorough classification by genres and selection of the best texts. Thus the task of literary theory is to recommend a writer ‘best precedents’ – the best way to create a perfect work. This ‘best way’ lies in merging with literary tradition (which identifies with Logos-Dao) and predicting its future development. Such merging is interpreted as the true poetic inspiration (in contrast to a false one). Rozhdesvensky writes:

‘Chinese literature is oriented to the analysis of the process of a text creation, while the text receivers are a kind of ‘bracketed off’. The author deals with the history of literature rather than with a reader. His audience is his ancestors and descendants within the infinite time of literature existence’. [12, p.192].

The second conventional layer is an accepted literary canon that distinguishes one national literature from another. For example, Russian and German literature see

their source in folklore, hence the very structure of literary texts and their language suppose certain convergence between literature and folk speech. On the contrary, English literature leaves aside the Germanic origin of folk speech and relies on philosophical, journalistic and legal prose, with their Latin-oriented and French-oriented vocabulary. [14, p.121]

A literary canon makes a part of literary theory which is formulated basically by literary critics who divide their attention between interpreting the content/ideas of literary texts and studying their language. The development of ideas and their verbal expression are traced by literary criticism as a history of style. Thanks to critics' descriptions of style (the style of writers' ideas and the style of linguistic form of their expression), there is an opportunity to trace the language dynamics and reflect it in normative books.

In the 20th c., literary theory and criticism were greatly shaped by the ideas of the Russian Formal school whose representatives developed, as Rozhdestvensky says in 'Theory of Rhetoric', in two directions [16, p.141]. Yuri Tynianov tried to interpret a literary work starting his analysis with the writer's biography. Because the writer's message, as it was conceived in his heart, is blurred and obscured as the time passed, Tynianov constructed 'the image of the author' within a specific social context [18]. For this purpose he presented a metaphorical image of the author in his novels. And this was, as Rozhdestvensky describes it, 'a rhetorical way of interpreting a literary text, based on ethos'.

On the other hand, Victor Vinogradov proceeded from a literary text itself, its words and phraseology, creating his method of analysis of writer's words based on the final product - the text, and building a system of comparative and historical oppositions . It makes it difficult to get to the social context. But the writer's language (in its linguistic meaning) was revealed and the two disciplines, 'historical stylistics' and 'history of the language of literature' were created. The comparison of literary texts, according to Vinogradov's approach, is conducted by immanent and projective methods. By immanent method he meant the analysis of

the inner qualities of the content and form in terms of style, while by projective method – comparison with other literary texts, existed before and those current, in terms of stylistic innovations they bring, and their artistic value. For a projective study, Vinogradov recommended to involve a comparison of literary texts with those of prosaic and proso-poetic genres to reveal stylistic innovations of literary texts [6, p.110].

Rozhdestvensky's developments of Vinogradov's 'image of an author' are to be found in a number of works of his students who wrote their Ph.D. theses under his supervision:

Polyakova, I.: content-analysis of literary texts. 200 Russian most frequent verbs and adjectives were considered in different text structures in terms of quantitative and qualitative characteristics they acquire in literary discourse. In that way, different writers' techniques and their treatment of conventional vocabulary were elucidated.

Tazmina, T.: developed a method of rhythmical representation of prosaic speech.

Subbotina, M.: analyzed works of literary criticism through their key words, identified different types of composition of key-words in different critics.

Salieva, L.: considered the category of 'the image of an author' based on 8 Russian translations of a fragment of 'Sentimental Journey' by L. Stern. 'The image of the author' appeared to have different structures in each translation.

Khazanova, O.: investigated 'the image of the author' in modern literature; developed Vinogradov's idea about a literary parody as a stylistic boundary within the literary process. Correlated the data of content-analysis of literary dictionaries and encyclopedias with analysis of literary texts with elements of linguistic parody (20th c.).

In "Introduction to Culture Studies"(1996), Rozhdestvensky considers the dynamics of criteria of literary criticism as being determined by the whole

composition of text genres that existed during a certain historic period [13, p.132, 133].

In the time when all homiletic genres were not formed yet, literary texts were represented by stage-speech at the theatre and poems accompanied by music. There was a criterion of entertaining speech that juxtaposed with serious genres like myth, epos and history.

As soon as formation of homiletic genres had been completed and literary canons had been established, literary texts acquired their value depending on the artistry with which they illustrated the ideas of the Holy Writ, Holy History and morality. For example, genre of Muslim '5 poems', mystic poetry by Teresa of Avila and St. John of the Cross, philosophical lyric poetry (16c.).

With print advent, in addition to text readability, there appeared a requirement to bring about new ideas and be in some cases ahead of the theological literature in terms of morality, and be competing with journalism in the field of ideas. The ideological judgement and expression of subjective personal view became a leading criterion for literary criticism. That was how Belinsky wrote his criticism, and why Potebnya rejected any merits of religious literature naming it 'decline of the language'.

Poetics of Russian symbolists demanded from a poet to show his/her personal awareness of the world through impressions received by all his/her senses (the way it was described by A. Bloc). Tolstoy and Nicolay Rerikh offered religious works of their own.

The formation of mass media required from literature the translation of state ideology, on the one hand, and documental precision, on the other.

Rozhdestvensky's ideas on literary criticism dynamics are summarized in the chart below:

<i>CULTURAL STAGES</i>	<i>GENRE SYSTEMS</i>	<i>REQUIREMENTS OF LITERARY CRITICISM</i>
ORAL-WRITTEN	MYTHS, EPOS, HISTORY // DRAMA, LYRICS	ENTERTAINING QUALITIES
WRITTEN	... + HOMILETIC GENRES	ILLUSTRATIONS TO THE BIBLE, HOLY HISTORY & ETHICS
PRINTED	... + SCIENTIFIC, JOURNALISTIC, LITERARY TEXTS	NOVELTY , PERSONAL VIEW, AHEAD OF RELIGIOUS VALUES
MASS COMMUNICATION	... + MASS MEDIA GENRES	In accord with SYMBOLIC UMBRELLA; DOCUMENTAL ACCURACY

Having provided a brief outline of Yuri Rozhdestvensky's ideas of aesthetic function of language, semiotics of literature, development of literary process and literary criticism, I would like to emphasize that it is the whole system of all text genres in their interdependence, through various culture regions and historic periods that really inspired my teacher. However, with all his great erudition in the matters of the past, he placed his central interest in the speech of the 20th c., which he described, classified and tried to make more effective.

I look forward to continue my research in the field and invite everyone's questions and comments.

Bibliography

1. Bakhtin, M. Problems of Poetics of Dostoevsky. Moscow, 1972.
2. Bible. Revelation. 14:2
3. Concise Literary Encyclopedia. Moscow, 1962-1978.
4. Jacobson, R. The Latest Russian Poetry. First Outline (Viktor Khlebnikov). Prague, 1921. P.11
5. Jacobson, R. Style in Language. N.Y. 1960. P. 350-377.
6. Khazanova, O. Literary Text As a Fact of Cultural Selection. M., 'Nauka I Schkola', 2015, #3. P.105-113.
7. Khazanova, O. Stylistic Characteristics of the Linguistic Systems of the English and Russian Languages. M., Problemy Linguistiki I Prepodavania Inostrannyh Yazykov. 2000, #4. P. 139,140.
8. Literary Encyclopedia. Moscow, 1929-1939.
9. Mayakovsky, V. Domo! M., 'Molodaya Gvardia', 1926, # 1.
10. Potebnya, A. On Lectures on Theory of Slovesnost. Fable, Proverb, Saying'. Kharkov, 1894.
11. Potebnya, A. Thought and Language. M., Labyrinth, 1999.
12. Rozhdestvensky, Y.V. General Philology. Moscow, 1996. Fond 'Novoie Tysiacheletie', 1996.
13. Rozhdestvensky, Y.V. Introduction to Culture Studies. P.34, 35
14. Rozhdestvensky, Y.V. Introduction to General Linguistics. M., ACADEMIA, 2005. P. 121.
15. Rozhdestvensky, Y.V. Principles of Modern Rhetoric. M., Fond 'Novoie Tysiacheletie', 1999, P.56, 57.
16. Rozhdestvensky, Y.V. Theory of Rhetoric. Moscow, 1997. P. 141, 142.
17. Tolstoy, L. Collected works in 20 volumes. M., Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1965. Vol.19.
18. Tynianov, Y. Poetics. History of Literature. Cinema. M., 1977. – P. 255-269.
19. Vinogradov, V. Theory of Artistic Speech. M., "Vyschaya Schkola", 2005. P. 10-18.
20. Vinogradov, V. Problems of Russian Stylistics. M., "Vyschaya Schkola", 1981.
21. Vinokur, G. Selected works on the Russian Language. M., 1959. - P. 388-393.