

Landscape models in the literary architectonics

Ogneva E.A.

Text as the cognitive format of keeping and knowledge delivering is the general goal of linguistic researches. According to N.F. Alefirenko “text is the communicative format which is united many components into one semantic structure by the communicative writer’s intention” [Alefirenko, p. 303], but I.R. Galperin noted that “text is the communicative format having the integral structure included the title and phrases. These phrases are united by different types of lexical, grammatical, and stylistic intercommunication having the pragmatic goal” [Galperin, p. 18].

Having done some textual researches, E.S. Kubryakova paid attention to text as “informative all-sufficient communicative format having the goal the addressee” [Kubryakova, p. 73].

We interpret the literary text as the cognitive-plot matrix, as the unity of people ethnomeaning represented as the model of writer’s world view. Text is the creative format of reality as the synergy of past, present, and future events represented by textual models. The textual modeling is the way to interpret the deep textual meanings including the literary landscape meaning.

Our author’s conception of literary landscape modeling bases on some important facts, such as:

Firstly, the literary architectonics is modeling as the complex cognitive knowledge format united literary concepts of different types.

Secondly, literary conceptual sphere model is the research construct which includes as the static knowledge formats, as dynamic one’s.

Thirdly, literary space is one of the most important segments of the cognitive-plot matrix. The interpreting of literary space is the base to interpret the literary landscape model as the cognitive format of knowledge. According to B.N. Levina “literary landscape is the format to accumulate, keep, and deliver the knowledge. This knowledge format is the way to national mentality understanding

[Levine, p. 401], that is why “landscape textual models have the main role as the cultural production” [Duncan 1990].

Fourthly, landscape textual model is meant as the research construct including landscape units which are integrated in one context. The specificity of landscape textual models is one the writer`s ideostyle parameters.

Fifthly, landscape unit as the base component of textual landscape model is studied as the textual unit to represent the landscape as the textual background to plot events, and characters specificity, that is why “the literary landscape language unit is researched as one of the most important space components of fiction conceptual sphere architectonics” [Ogneva 2014]

Sixthly, landscape textual model represents three types of landscape: (a) surface landscape, such as woodland scenery, steppe scenery, mountain scenery, and so on; (б) water view, such as sea scenery, ocean scenery, and so on водный пейзаж; в) air view, such as the scenery of night sky, the scenery of Indian sky, and so on.

Seventhly, landscape textual model includes as the landscape units as “time markers to represent autumn landscape or winter landscape, and so on; б) society markers to represent the rural landscape or the monastery landscape, and so on” [Ogneva, p. 616].

To sum up, the cognitive-hermeneutic interpreting of different literary landscape models discovered the high frequency of models as the unit of two or three types of landscape. For example, the mountain river scenery is the synergy of mountain scenery and water scenery; the ocean sunrise scenery is the synergy of air scenery and water scenery. The parameters of landscape models depend on writer`s world view, genre of text, main idea of the text.

Literary landscape models interpreting is so informative way to research the specificity of literary conceptual sphere and the specificity of writer`s ideostyle.

REFERENCES

1. Alefirenko N.F. Discussible semantics issues. Moscow: Gnosis, 2005.

2. Galperin I.R. Text as the object of linguistics research. Moscow: Komkniga, 2007.
3. Kubryakova E.S. About the text and criteria of its determination // Text. Structure and semantics. Vol. 1. Moscow, 2001. Pp. 72-81.
4. Levina V.N. Landscape conceptualization in the literary text // Cognitive linguistic researches. Vol. IV. World conceptualization in the language / Ch.-editor E.S. Kubryakova. Moscow: Linguistics Institute RAN; Tambov: Tambov State University named after G.R. Dergavin, 2009. Pp. 398-413.
5. Ogneva E.A. Literary conceptual sphere structuring // Mental bases of language as the functional system / Ch.-editor N.A. Besedina. Cognitive linguistic researches. Vol. XIII. Tambov: Tambov State University named after G.R. Dergavin, 2013. Pp. 614-625.
6. Ogneva E.A. Specificity of Space Landscape Language Units at the Fiction Conceptsphere. Journal of Language and Literature. 2014. T. 5. #3. Pp. 54-58.
7. Duncan J.S. The city as the text: the politics of landscape interpretation in the Kandyan kingdom. Cambridge University press, 1990.