

УЧРЕЖДЕНИЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ  
«ГРОДНЕНСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ  
ИМЕНИ ЯНКИ КУПАЛЫ»

ФЕДЕРАЛЬНОЕ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ БЮДЖЕТНОЕ  
ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНОЕ УЧРЕЖДЕНИЕ ВЫСШЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ  
«МОСКОВСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ  
ИМЕНИ М. В. ЛОМОНОСОВА»

ФЕДЕРАЛЬНОЕ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ БЮДЖЕТНОЕ  
ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНОЕ УЧРЕЖДЕНИЕ ВЫСШЕГО  
ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ  
«РОССИЙСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКИЙ  
УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМЕНИ А. И. ГЕРЦЕНА»

**ЯЗЫК.  
КОММУНИКАЦИЯ.  
КУЛЬТУРА**

*Сборник научных статей*

Гродно  
«ЮрСаПринт»  
2022

УДК 37.016:811.581  
ББК 81.711  
Я 41

Рекомендовано Редакционно-издательским советом  
ГрГУ им. Янки Купалы

Редакционная коллегия:

*С. В. Адамович (гл. ред.), В. А. Белозорович, Л. В. Рычкова,  
Н. Н. Овчинникова, Л. М. Середа*

Рецензенты:

**Разводовская Я. В.**, кандидат филологических наук, доцент (ГрГМУ);  
**Минчук И. И.**, кандидат филологических наук,  
доцент (ГрГУ им. Янки Купалы)

Я41 **Язык.** Коммуникация. Культура : сб. науч. ст. / ГрГУ им. Янки Купалы [и др.] ;  
редкол.: С. В. Адамович (гл. ред.) [и др.] . – Гродно : ЮрСаПринт, 2022. – 392 с.

ISBN 978-985-7257-41-6.

В научных статьях, вошедших в сборник, рассматривается широкий круг вопросов, связанных с изучением языка, коммуникации и культуры в широком спектре аспектов, таких как экология языка, контактная вариантология, транслингвальные практики в коммуникации, межкультурная коммуникация, двуязычие и многоязычие, языковая политика, языки для специальных целей, исследования в области литературы и перевода, китаеведения. Издание подготовлено по итогам Международной научной конференции «Язык. Коммуникация. Культура». Адресовано научным работникам, преподавателям, аспирантам, магистрантам, студентам и всем, кто интересуется вопросами данной проблематикой.

УДК 37.016:811.581  
ББК 81.711

ISBN 978-985-7257-41-6

© “ЮрСаПринт”, оформление, 2022  
© ГрГУ им. Янки Купалы, 2022

*Елена Витальевна Гулевич*, Гродненский государственный университет имени Янки Купалы, г. Гродно, Республика Беларусь.

**Alena Hulevich**

Yanka Kupala State University of Grodno, Grodno, The Republic of Belarus

e-mail: family2001KG@mail.ru

## **RECEPTIVE THEORY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE COMPARATIVE AND HISTORICAL STUDY OF LITERATURES**

Representatives of receptive aesthetics (W. Iser, H. R. Jauss and others) postulated interpretive variation as an indispensable attribute of perception of a work of art. In this case its interpretive openness acts as a result of variation between communicative definiteness (givenness) of the text and communicative uncertainty and guarantees the multiplicity of interpretations, which ensures the semantic dynamics and, as a consequence, the immortality of the literary work. At the same time, based on the creative nature of artistic perception postulated by the receptive theory, comparative studies allow us to specify the type and nature of interactions between the giving and receiving consciousness. This comprehensive use of the provisions of key theories for the process of reception enables us to present an overall picture of interliterary interactions accurately and more in detail.

*Keywords:* receptive theory, theory of aesthetic response, comparative and historical method, reception, W. Jauss, H. R. Iser.

УДК 82.091

**J. Delvaux**

## ***THE INNOCENT: THE TRANSFORMATION OF TOLSTOYAN INSPIRATIONS, FROM THE NOVEL BY D'ANNUNZIO TO THE FILM BY VISCONTI***

The influences of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky are sufficiently attested in *The Innocent* to identify a “Russian” period for d’Annunzio, before his discovery of Nietzsche. In 1976, Visconti produced an adaptation; he died without having said much about his film. If the influence of Dostoevsky, who is never named in the novel, is natural to him, he transforms or deletes the two most Tolstoyan characters, Federico and Giovanni, declaring that they were not an authentic creation of d’Annunzio; but the issues seem to lay deeper.

*Keywords:* d’Annunzio’s Russian period, Visconti’s last film, political intentions, Tolstoyan inspiration, the nature of a call, closed universe, figures of otherness.

The influences of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky are sufficiently explicit and present in *The Innocent* (1892) to designate a phase of “Russian evangelism” in d’An-

nunzio's work, even if this was soon abandoned in favour of the elective discovery of Nietzsche [1, p. 102; 2, p. 481–483; 3, p. 139]. His story is that of Tullio Hermil, an aristocrat in his thirties, a tireless seducer, whose attempts to return to pure conjugal love ended in infanticide: disappointed in the second part of his ideal of “being constantly unfaithful to a constantly faithful wife”, he plunged his wife Giuliana's adulterous newborn child into the freezing cold of the night just before Christmas. His inability to overcome jealousy and the need to resort to murder testify to the profound failure of the announcement of the Dannunzian superman.

If wanting to isolate too firmly the contours of Russian inspirations, which is mixed with French sources (Flaubert, Verlaine, Maupassant) can be seen as too risky, we can nevertheless highlight the structuring of the story around a crime and the confession that follows, even if the latter does not have the same spiritual and restorative significance as in *Crime and Punishment* (Dostoevsky, 1866). Product of an attempt to create a novel based exclusively on an introverted and tormented psychology [4, p. 75], *The Innocent* manifests Dostoyevskian inspirations in its announcements of the Dannunzian superman, at a time when the Italian writer had not yet discovered Nietzsche [2, p. 481–483]. Other inspirations can be identified in the descriptions of the neurotic and the criminal, which also marked the German philosopher. In the same period, the *Giovanni Episcopo*'s “inetto” (1892) gives a remarkable expression of the neurotic in a world of petty officials, reminiscent of *A Faint Heart* (Dostoevsky, 1848) and other short stories. Tolstoy's imprint is, among other things, present in the sense of the *The Innocent*'s sense of marital turmoil, its attempts at spiritual renewal, as well as his holy exaltation of the earth.

In 1976, Luchino Visconti, who called d'Annunzio “the most significant representative of European decadence” [5, p. 187], filmed an adaptation of d'Annunzio's novel; he died during the editing phase. He shares with the d'Annunzio of 1892 an admiration for Dostoevsky, as can be seen in the adaptation of *White Nights* (1957), the psychology and relationships between characters in *Rocco and His Brothers* (1960), which are marked by *The Idiot* (Dostoevsky, 1869) and its phenomenon of doubles, as well as certain scenes in *The Damned* (1969), which have already been analysed [6, p. 156–162]. Of course, the inspiration that the filmmaker naturally draws from the Russian author is played out on his own levels, and one cannot disagree with Arnod who considers that he “only superficially shares his moral and spiritual complexity” [7, p. 115]; but this observation is also valid for the d'Annunzio post-1892 that one can already suspect preludes to it in the novel *The Innocent*. In any case, whatever Visconti's Dostoyevskian depth, it would be less easy to find references to Tolstoy in him. And if the first Russian author is never named in either the novel or the film, Tolstoy is referred in a strong way in d'Annunzio's work, whereas he is erased in the film.

In the novel, *War and Peace* (Tolstoy, 1865–1869) is described as the “great book that had appeared in the West” [8, p. 428]. Tullio offered it to his wife Giuli-

ana, who reads it with passion and considers it “both sad and consoling” [8, p. 429]. Giuliana loves the character of Mary Bolkonskaya whose, kindness recalls that of her sister-in-law, or Lise, known as “the little Princess”, the wife of Prince Andrei, who dies at the beginning of book two, just after giving birth. Giuliana, who also has certain characteristics of *Anna Karenina* (Tolstoy, 1877), is herself an infinitely good character with a suffering body, whose second pregnancy was terrible. In Visconti’s film, we do see Giuliana at one point picking up a book, sitting in the garden of a family estate. She opens it, but the book is then kept out of frame [9, p. 79]. The spectator will never know that it was *War and Peace*. Although the script called for it to be placed on the table, for Tullio to pick it up and read aloud a passage marked by Giuliana, which we will find in the next few lines.

The reference to Tolstoy, while erased, is at the centre of some of Visconti’s profound changes. What are these changes and what are the reasons for them, known or suspected? The modification of a male character is particularly remarkable: that of Tullio’s brother Federico. We also note the disappearance of another: the old peasant Giovanni di Scòrdio, whom Federico introduced Tullio to. The first is directly inspired by Levin of *Anna Karenina*, the other is a peasant symbol of martyrdom, infinite goodness and love of the land. The inner beauty of these characters stirs like appeals: although they are unaware of the child’s adulterous reality, they address to Tullio in the sense of love of neighbour and acceptance. Insufficient lights, however, since they will not prevent him from committing his crime... Visconti, who was unable to speak at length about his last film, said that these “Russian” characters appeared to him to be “false” [10, p. 270], well representative of certain temptations of d’Annunzio, who was willingly artificial and sometimes plagiaristic.

It seems, however, that the changes that revolve around the inspiration to Tolstoy are rooted in deeper motives and must be understood at least in part with a key to political interpretation. For Visconti’s intentions in this respect were discreet but clear: “Tullio and Giuliana belong to the Italian upper bourgeoisie, responsible for the advent of fascism. *The Innocent* is the story of the disintegration not only of a family, but also of a certain society and a certain Italy” [10, p. 270].

The following lines will first give some general elements about the film. They will then focus on the transformation of Federico Hermil and Giovanni di Scòrdio.

### **General changes in the adaptation and situation of a Tolstoyan appeal.**

Luchino Visconti’s 1976 adaptation involves more or less fundamental changes to the novel, including the character’s final suicide, a more modern affirmation of the female characters, a more marked withdrawal of Tullio’s mother, the disappearance of his two daughters, and a more present worldly setting. It is likely that for some of these changes Visconti entered into a dialogue with d’Annunzio’s work beyond *The Innocent*, taking inspiration from the salons and the character of Elena Muti in *Il Piacere* (1889), or from the final suicide in *Il Trionfo della morte* (1894),

although the latter is less obvious. Where the writer's stubborn egocentrism had constructed the main character as an alter ego, the film demonstrates Visconti's refusal to identify himself or to let the viewer identify with him, especially in the way certain shots are arranged [11, p. 383–385]. Moreover, the filmmaker has exacerbated the egoism and the socio-psychological and ideological isolation of his character, while the Dannunzian Tullio tries to understand the examples of Federico and the peasant Giovanni. In the novel, Tullio also remains relatively connected to the servants he has known since childhood, or to a Christian tradition, even if this is understood only through mechanical rituals and a purely self-interested conception of the relationship to God.

D'Annunzio suggests a much more pronounced continuity of soul between Federico and Giuliana than in the film, and she is idealised as much by her brother-in-law as by her mother-in-law. A passage that she marked in *War and Peace* sums up and gives voice to the Tolstoyan appeal, by which we must also understand the role of Federico and the peasant Giovanni with Tullio. It is the passage from the illuminations of Pierre Bezukhov at the Torjok post house during his meeting with the old stranger (Bazdeev): “You are young, you are rich, you are intelligent. What have you done with all these gifts? Are you happy with yourself and your existence? (...) What have you done for your neighbour? Have you thought of your thousands of servants? (...) No, have you not? You have taken advantage of their fatigue to lead a corrupt life. Have you tried to do all you could for the good of your neighbour? No. You have lived in idleness (...)” [8, p. 429–430].

This appeal can also be seen in the sad, dying eyes of the little Princess Lisa, which will long challenge the conscience of Prince Andrei Bolkonsky: “What have you done with me?” [8, p. 69]. Tullio, whose natural melancholy is intensified by the loss of the ideal of a pure wife, feels unable to share any atmosphere of consolation or humble acceptance, but he at least tries to understand those extracts that his wife has marked as well as their embodiment in the goodness of his brother Federico, the peasant Giovanni, or Giuliana herself. After the adulterous child is born, her gaze seems to address him with the distressing cry of the little Princess Lisa: “What have you done with me?”. Tullio glimpses this call to responsibility towards the other and to love, but he never reaches its universal scope, despite the fleeting enlightenment he declares after his crime.

In Visconti's case, the script's decision to have Tullio read the extract was not retained in the final version.

**Federico Hermil: from listened intermediary to castrated.** In d'Annunzio, Federico is twenty-seven years old. Although he logically shares the same social roots with his brother, he has almost always lived in the countryside, in an intimate relationship with the land that has brought him close to the essential joys and energies. He resembles *Anna Karenina's* Levin in his values of perseverance in work and his ideal of goodness, but he is also endowed with a much more natu-

rally integrated understanding of nature and the peasants: directly dexterous, infallible in charisma with old and young alike, “he possessed the Rule. Leo Tolstoy, kissing him on his beautiful serene forehead, would have called him his son” [8, p. 413]. At his side, Tullio feels reassured, purified, invigorated, called to marvel at the sight of those buds that cover an old trunk that was thought to be dead, or in face of the innocence of a morning with its purple airs, of those mornings in which one day Tolstoy saw the face of God [12].

Federico’s gaze is also one of the ways in which the older boy expresses outlines of his self-criticism, wondering in more than one situation how his brother would have behaved. Federico tends to be invested with a position of guardianship and under his guidance Tullio tries for a while to find serenity through manual labour. His hands, however, seem condemned to remain those of the landlord, white and clumsy: the building of a firm land in itself requires a greatness of soul and a sense of humility that Tullio will never attain.

Visconti’s Federico, played by Didier Haudepin, is much more common. He has become a military man who, like many of his peers from good families – this type is so common in Tolstoy that he could be the young Tolstoy himself – but is far less altruistic and mystical than he is fond of parties and horses. Based on a scene deleted from the script, Giori identifies the character as a double of Visconti himself, who spent his entire youth at the racecourse [11, p. 381]. And the same commentator has highlighted a fundamental transformation: the filmmaker makes Federico a friend of the rival, Giuliana’s presumed lover and father of the child: a writer named Arborio (who becomes d’Arborio in Visconti’s film, probably in tribute to d’Annunzio). Federico thus no longer indicates the saint, the call to humility and otherness that Tullio will not listen to: he now indicates the rival, who is not only the sexual other, but also an other in the sense that he comes from a lower social class, and has risen through his own merits.

A certain superficiality in Federico does not prevent him from representing a partial retreat in Visconti; even if this retreat is mainly due to the fact that he only returns to his family nucleus only on leave of absence. Using the freedoms of his bachelor life, the announcement of a birth at Tullio’s house suits him well enough for his mother to stop urging him to marry. If her principled benevolence cannot be questioned and if Arnod is perhaps too quick to say that he has “almost nothing in common with his Dannunzian equivalent, except for the first name” [7, p. 246], he is even more ineffective and opens up no real alternative to Tullio. His benevolence is certainly not to be questioned, but he alternates between lack of lucidity about his brother’s adulterous, jealous and soon to be hateful lifestyle towards the child, and convenient evasions when he is close to becoming aware of it.

Visconti’s Federico has something of the inability of Aliosha Karamazov to listen to the gravity of a situation that is turning into a drama, and he is ineffective in that he seems resigned to the fact that his elder will never evolve. Con-

trary to the novel, he no longer exudes any charismatic influence with the latter, who even seems constantly annoyed by it (but by whom is he not?); the confrontations never go beyond gentle mockery or are diluted by flight. However, Visconti has not completely forgotten the Federico of the novel. Thus, while Tullio tries to arrange a meeting with d'Arborio through his younger brother, probably with the secret aim of challenging him to a duel, Federico tells him that the writer has contracted an illness in Africa: "D'Arborio is in not doing well. Really not. He is a man who deserves respect. This is not only a great writer, but also an angel. The only person in the world that, when I think about... I have a feeling of shame, or almost (...) If you think about it, maybe even you understand it. We are so smart... We have studied so much... travelled... We have so much fun... We are so rich... and then?" [9, p. 103].

Tullio, radicalised in his egoism and weaned on any self-criticism in relation to the novel, replies to him in a dry voice: "What kind of nonsense are you talking?". Here, as elsewhere, he casts out the words of his younger brother as soon as they threaten to open up a "different" field of questioning. And Federico's answer is typical of his character: "I don't even know myself. Good night" [9, p. 103]. Tullio's way of interrupting his interlocutor is, of course, a way of answering the question in order not to ask it to himself. His perverse logic is already apparent: he locks the world inside "his truth", inside his jealous projections, and suffocates everything that threatens to relativise them. But Federico does not seem to have taken the measure of his own question: d'Arborio deserves respect because, coming from a modest background, he owes everything to himself... The writer has acted as a tutor for Federico in order to finance his own studies, and Federico turns him into a kind of idealized older brother. At a deeper level, it was a timid suggestion of the Tolstoyan appeal, stated in the first person: "What have you done with the goods you have received? Have you put them at the service of your neighbour? No, you have lived in idleness".

Tullio does not care about this question: he denies any inscription in the lack and ignores any symbolic sense of debt. This deafness of Visconti's character, focused at the expense of the rest on the setbacks of his masculinity, subtly gives the film a more Manichean turn than that presented in d'Annunzio's novel. At no time does he experience the slightest sensation of a little light wavering in front of his eyes, like the one his gaze, like the one that could still flicker sometimes, very fleetingly, in front of a Nikolai Stavrogin. Federico tended to suggest to him the value of work and the need for an ethics of social privilege. Here Giori reaffirms the filmmaker's understudy in Federico [11, p. 381]: Visconti has succeeded in sublimating the superficiality of his aristocratic condition, just as Tullio's younger brother is beginning to do. He also understands the finesse of his writer friend, like the filmmaker who recognised a master in Jean Renoir. As for Tullio



and his muted fantasy of self-foundation, Giori takes the step of recognising in it the prefiguration of the Fascist.

**Giovanni di Scòrdio: the ousted saint.** Giovanni, suppressed by Visconti, is a symbolic peasant who constitutes by his very existence a call, a light. Tullio tends to seek it out when he feels driven by dishonourable ideas or when he feels he is without solutions [8, p. 621]. The opposite figure to Tullio, who accepts life only on condition that it conforms to his dream, this “solitary saint” [8, p. 538] is a martyr incapable of resentment despite the worst experiences. Federico suggests him to Tullio to be the child’s godfather, as a sublime example of life. Giovanni is touched by this request, which comes from his masters, and should have been the link in a circuit of identification that will never be completed, or too late, from Tullio to the Innocent. The old man is a father as stripped by his wife and abandoned by his fourteen children as the Innocent is himself naked and bereft of any father figure. The novel closes by expressing this community of soul through the continuity of tones, the white of the clothes and hair, in front of the little coffin [8, p. 635].

Exhilarated by his reading of Tolstoy, d’Annunzio shows that suffering elevates the greatness of the soul, without which intelligence is worthless; and it distracts from the problems of abundance. The descriptions surrounding Giovanni are reminiscent of the agricultural world inhabited by beliefs, which Tolstoy was keen to convey; or the pure world of *Anna Karenin*’s Levin haunted by the development of the railway. By never fully accessing the essential truths that he feels in his brother Federico and above all in Giovanni, the Dannunzian Tullio does not know the itinerary and the happiness of the simple joys of a Pierre Bezukhov, whose captivity with the French gives him the gift of meeting the old and humble Platon Karataev, or of hearing an account of injustice and suffering sublimated into a joy for life, fundamentally unaware of any resentment.

Giovanni is the subject of strong physical descriptions, as they are more often present in Tolstoy than in Dostoevsky, at the same time as he is dissolved in his symbol: “His whole person was simple, sacred and grandiose” [8, p. 590]. The old man is a sad forehead, a faded mouth where a smile of acceptance is revealed, which goes as far as hope, a slow and wide gesture: that of the sacred sower, and a hand; the one that will carry the Innocent to baptism. The character’s verisimilitude is undoubtedly compromised by his symbolism, and if it must be admitted that while in *Terra vergine* (1882), *La Figlia di Iorio* (1903) or his *Saint Sebastian* (1910), d’Annunzio is credible in his paintings of martyrs or the peasant world, it is not with the Giovanni of *The Innocent* that he creates his most authentic character. However, he makes up for this with the aesthetics of his landscapes, his twilight scenes in the snow, the last crimson rays on the dark waters, the jetties of grain through which the old man walks and which tint the light like flakes of gold... [8, p. 586–588].

In *The Earth trembles* (1948), Visconti had also suggested with a painterly finesse a hieratic quality to his characters. It was not Giovanni who inspired him to repeat the process. Beyond the fact that the d'Annunzio's character emerges from a fixed conception, disturbing in its condescension of social relationships, it is not so natural for Visconti to isolate such territories of innocence; or at the very least of resignation. Just as in Dostoevsky's case, children are shown to be capable of torturing animals, the Idiot himself is not innocent of the practical annoyances caused by his inability to make decisions or take responsibility, and that Alyosha Karamazov is not free of parricidal guilt, the filmmaker closes *Rocco and His Brothers* with the words of Ciro, the fourth brother: "You can't always forgive. Rocco's goodness is as dangerous as Simone's wickedness".

If there is innocence in Dostoevsky and Visconti, it is most often the result of a psychological repression of the ethical conflict, the inability to assume the evil in itself [13, p. 89–94], than a full metaphysical vocation expressible in an icon; even if Rocco's disanctified evocations of the distant country may suggest this type of figuration and invite the greatest nuance. D'Annunzio would not contradict these elements and will not support for long the Giovanni's overly one-sided appeal to purity: barely five years later had he even nourished the project of writing a *Life of the Antichrist* [14, p. 171–172].

**Final reflections and aftermath.** D'Annunzio's narrative is structured around a crime and its confession; it evolves within complex feelings and a very closed family constellation of the upper bourgeoisie or aristocracy. Tolstoy's inspired characters energeise her, in terms of appeal and (non-)response; a perspective that is otherwise totally erased, highly relativised and radically transformed by Visconti. Apart from the fact that Visconti judged the "Russian characters" as "false", there is nothing to suggest that what he first retained from Tolstoy's immense universe was the "religion of pity" identified by the Vate.

Other hypotheses could be the subject of future research.

If *Il Piacere* (1889), *Il Trionfo della Morte* (1894) and later *Il Fuoco* (1900) offer great panoramas of the Trinità dei Monti in Rome, of the powerful breath of the Abruzzi sea, or of the domes of Venice set ablaze by the sunset, the most eloquent spaces in *L'Innocente* are those of the forest, the Assòro valley and the expanse of the Hermil family's fields. The preservation of the two characters in their agricultural theme would have made it necessary to complete the interior decorations with a completely different type of staging. And explaining the reference to Tolstoy could also have implied having to keep his skies, sometimes burnt by their sun, sometimes barred by iron rains, in which the Russian author likes to point out the insignificance of a Napoleon or any other human triumph.

In line with the political intentions evoked by Visconti, it is on the other hand remarkable that the closure of the sets expresses the systematic crushing of any "other" perspective, like Tullio who castrates Federico's words... Ishaghpour

affirms that aesthetics serves “the derisory assertion of immanence” [15, p. 107], and Vecchiali is right to say that “the simple and direct illustration of this universe was its most just condemnation, the more ruthless” [16, p. 142].

Another reason may be internal to Visconti’s work, insofar as there is in him a specific form of otherness in his own work and from the start with the character of the Stranger in *Obsession* (1943), an essential milestone in the advent of neorealism: the Stranger is a character who evokes a voice from elsewhere in full fascist era, of which Visconti affirmed that it is “the most important element”, that “through which I wanted to represent the essential features of my work” [17, p. 61]. It is possible that the filmmaker did not seek to refer to the immense universe of Tolstoy because he wanted to take up this theme of the call, with him more enigmatic, poetic and without suggestions of martyrdom.

Further research could be focused on the interpretation of the Tolstoyan appeal of the novel in the terms of the philosophy of Levinas, and this treatment of the meeting of the Other which passes by the question of the murder. They could also mobilize the psychoanalysis of Daniel Lagache to understand to what extent in the illustration of the denial of otherness homicidal jealousy was a particularly judicious theme for Visconti.

#### References

1. D’Annunzio, G. Carteggio D’Annunzio-Hérelle (1891–1931) / ed. by M. Cimini. – Lanciano, 2004. – 798 p.
2. Tosi, G. D’Annunzio découvre Nietzsche / G. Tosi // *Italianistica*, Anno II-n°3, settembre-décembre / ed.: F. Del Beccaro, R. Negri. – Milano, 1973. – 35 p.
3. Serra, M. D’Annunzio le magnifique / M. Serra. – Paris, 2018. – 697 p.
4. Cimini, M. D’Annunzio, la Francia e la cultura europea / M. Cimini. – Lanciano, 2016. – 293 p.
5. Visconti, L. Conférence de presse, octobre 1975 / L. Visconti // *Théâtres au cinéma* / ed. by D. Bax. – Bobigny, 2004. – 223 p.
6. Bergen, V. Luchino Visconti. Les promesses du crépuscule / V. Bergen. – Bruxelles, 2017. – 224 p.
7. Arnod, J.-C. Luchino Visconti entre Giovanni Verga et Gabriele D’Annunzio : Thèse de Doctorat en Langues, Littératures et Civilisations romanes. – Paris-Nanterre, 2017. – 317 p.
8. D’Annunzio, G. Prose di romanzi / G. D’Annunzio. – Milano, 2000. – 1349 p.
9. Cecchi d’Amico, S. L’Innocente. Libera riduzione dal romanzo omonimo di Gabriele D’Annunzio (a cura di A. Cattini) / S. Cecchi d’Amico, E. Medioli, L. Visconti. – Mantova, 2006. – 128 p.
10. Visconti, L. Interview de Mauro De Lumière, in *Spettacoli et Società*, 17 octobre 1975 / L. Visconti // *Visconti* / ed.: M. Schneider, L. Schirmer. – Arles, 2009. – 320 p.
11. Giori, M. Scandalo e banalità. Rappresentazioni dell’eros in Luchino Visconti (1963-1976) / M. Giori. – Milano, 2012. – 478 p.
12. Ambrière, F. Hommage à Léon Tolstoï / F. Ambrière // *Émission radio France Culture*, 1953.
13. Pluygers, C. L’au-delà de l’éthique chez Dostoïevski et Nietzsche / C. Pluygers // *Cahiers du Centre d’Etudes Pathoanalytiques*, n°4.–s. 1, 1996. – P. 89–94.
14. Hérelle, G. Gabriel d’Annunzio ou théorie et pratique de la surhumanité / G. Hérelle // ed. by M. Cimini. – Berne, 2015. – 425 p.

15. Ishaghpour, Y. D'une image à l'autre. La nouvelle modernité du cinéma / Y. Ishaghpour. – Paris, 1982. – 320 p.
16. Vecchiali, P. L'innocente / P. Vecchiali // Théâtres au cinéma / D. Bax. – Bobigny, 2004. – 223 p.
17. Sanzio, A. et Thirard, P.-L., Luchino Visconti cinéaste / A. Sanzio, P.-L. Thirard. – S. D, 1984. – 171 p.

**Julien Delvaux**, University of Catania, Catania, Italy; University of Liège, Liège, Belgium.

Translated from French by **Charles-Emmanuel Tilkin**, Brussels, Belgium.

**Жюльен Дельво**

Катанийский университет, г. Катания, Италия

Льежский университет, Льеж, Бельгия

e-mail: julien.delvaux@doct.uliege.be

УДК 81'367.623:[811.161.3+811.111]

**В. І. Жук**

## **СІНЭСТЭТЫЧНЫЯ ПЕРАНОСЫ І МЕТАФАРЫЗАЦЫЯ АД'ЕКТЫВАЎ АЛЬФАКТОРНАГА ПОЛЯ**

**(НА ПРЫКЛАДЗЕ БЕЛАРУСКІХ І АНГЛІЙСКІХ ПРЫМЕТНІКАЎ)**

Артыкул прысвечаны даследаванню з'явы сінэстэзіі сярод ад'ектываў з альфакторнымі лексіка-семантычнымі варыянтамі (ЛСВ). У артыкуле разглядаюцца шляхі рэалізацыі сінэстэтычных пераносаў прыметнікаў у беларускай і англійскай мовах, вылучаюцца узуальныя і аказіянальныя ад'ектывы лексічнага поля «пах», размяркоўваюцца групы метафарызацыі.

*Ключавыя словы:* сінэстэзія, альфакторная намінацыя, лексіка-семантычны варыянт, сувязь, пераход, метафарызацыя.

Развіццё мовы ў значнай меры абумоўлена развіццём яе словаўтваральнай сістэмы, станаўленнем новых словаўтваральных мадэлей слоў, змяненнем існуючых, павелічэннем або змяншэннем іх прадуктыўнасці і многімі іншымі фактарамі словаўтваральнага працэсу.

Сярод ад'ектываў пераважаюць вытворныя адзінкі. Большая колькасць якасных, а таксама ўсе адносныя і прыналежныя прыметнікі з'яўляюцца словамі вытворнымі. Утваральнай базай служаць розныя часціны мовы, аднак найбольш часта ад'ектывацыя назіраецца сярод назоўнікаў і дзеясловаў.