

## Slavonic conceptualizations in the epilogue of *Finnegans Wake* by J. Joyce

Elena Fomenko, Classic Private University, Zaporizhzhya, Ukraine, [clara8257@mail.ru](mailto:clara8257@mail.ru)

**Key words:** epiphanic model, multi-lingual discourse, Slavonic layer, cultural concept, textual-stylistic concept, language conceptualization

**Ключевые слова:** эпифаническая модель, мультингвальный дискурс, славянский слой, культурный концепт, тексто-стилевой концепт, языковая концептуализация

Present day multidisciplinary research seeks conceptual integrity of a work of fiction that puts together language, consciousness, and culture. The object of this study is to explore the conceptualizations that are designated by the Slavonic layer in *Finnegans Wake* by James Joyce [Joyce 2000] and to acquire a better understanding of the language, conceptual, mental, and psychological space in a fictional discourse that seems to lack a dominant language centre.

Specifically, the study seeks to investigate language conceptualizations in Book IV of the *Wake* with regard to the list of Slavonic lexemes in this part of the text. Despite many attempts at exploring the themes, motives, narratives, and lexicon of the *Wake*, this text's multi-language nature remains an unsolved puzzle. Current research points to the *Wake* as a dialogue of languages in a multi-lingual fictional discourse. The nature of this dialogue is sought in the Babel myth. Specifically, a renowned Joycean D. Attridge appraises Joyce's "multicultural architectural feat of total unification" [Attridge 2000: 158]. This assumption has its own grounds because of the unified results of human FALL.

Yet; there is no systemic research on the way the dominant English text absorbs from forty to sixty languages in naturalizations, paronomasia, antanaclasis, portmanteau words, and other stylistic devices. The pressing issue of language conceptualizations is still paid little attention. In the 1980s, Epstein advanced the idea that the language in the *Wake* serves as a filter that reflects on "the essence of human life" [Epstein 1983: 64]. But Epstein limits his study to the effect of paronomasia (puns) and antanaclasis (repetition of a single word that creates a different meaning each time). He fails to identify connection between Joyce's play of words using different languages and "the essence of human life". Henceforth, the integrative forces of multi-lingual conceptualizations still remain a pressing issue.

It is worth noting at the outset that transformational radicalism of the *Wake* is grounded on vagueness of linguistic forms. This structural principle Joyce exploits in the extreme. His cognitive structures are covered by multi-lingual verbalized conceptualizations. The simplest way is to say or name something in a number of languages, a foreign word repeated by an English one. The most complicated way is to think through conceptualizations that multiply double meanings that belong, through one form, to multiple meanings, through what can be inferred from this form via multi-lingual meaning.

For example, the female name "Alina" in *the voice of Alina* [Joyce 2000: 608.19] may be simultaneously taken for a Slavonic female name, which is popular in Ukraine in the form of Alina and in Russia in the form of Alena, and a reference to St. Alina of Forest whose feast takes place in Brabant on June 16, the famous Bloom's day of Joyce's *Ulysses*. The Slavonic network is built by *The cry of stena* [Joyce 2000: 608:16], that is, the cry of Alina on the town wall, but it fails to agree with the expectations of the Russian reader, since it is Yaroslavna who cries for her husband on the town wall in the Kievan Rus epic. Her first name was likely to be Euphrosyne, so there is no direct link with "Alina". However, in Old Germanic the

female name of Alina means “noble”. So, it is a noble woman who cries for her husband on the wall. Yaroslavna was a noble princess in Kievan Rus. Therefore, Joyce calls a noble woman in Kievan Rus “Alina”.

**The purpose of the present article** is to study the Slavonic layer in Book IV of the *Wake* in order to identify language conceptualizations that put the dominant text with Slavonic verbalizations together. First, I will comment on the list of Slavonic words that is given in the dictionary edited by Sandulescu [Sandulescu 2012]. Then, I will attempt at completing this list. Finally, I will explore verbalized conceptualizations in order to infer from them cognitive structures that involve the Slavonic layer.

This article uses **a functional-communicative approach** to Joyce’s idiostyle. It presents Joyce’s idiostyle in continuity of his epiphanic model. It is assumed that the *Wake* completes Joyce’s epiphanic model. Like all his texts, the *Wake* promotes cyclical continuity. This time, Joyce distorts our understanding of a mono-lingual text. The *Wake* may be viewed as a fictional discourse that ignores the dominance of one language by mastering many forms, available and invented contextually, to celebrate multi-language conceptualizations. Joyce puts into practice an epiphanic language that is a revelation of its own. Under the cover of multiple, flexible multi-lingual forms Joyce models simultaneity of co-existing cultures, languages, and worldviews.

**The present article argues** that Joyce employs multi-lingual verbalizations to cement language conceptualizations in order to create a fictional world in which no language, culture or consciousness has dominance or superiority over others.

The available list of Slavonic lexemes in Book IV in the dictionary edited by Sandulescu [Sandulescu 2012] cannot be viewed as complete. It is important to note that there is a continuing debate with regard to Joyce’s uses of one meaning in one linguistic form. The dictionary points to the lexeme *bludyn* [Joyce 2000: 593.3] as a Bulgarian lexeme. Together with other Slavonic lexemes of the same root, it originates from блудъ πορνεία. Yet, one more reading may be suggested when a Russian associative link is taken into account. *Bludyn* resembles a Russian four-letter word that stands for “whore” (Sandulescu’s dictionary traces many Slavonic swear words throughout the *Wake*). It is more likely to recognize the Russian word that designates the cardinal sin of “lust” (Russian “blud”). This reading refers to the Russian lexeme “sin” that appears earlier in the text in its Russian form inserted into the English possessive construction: *Grex’s* [Joyce 2000: 170.34]. Thus, Joyce points to the sinful world after the FALL whose conceptualizations are at the heart of the *Wake*.

The portmanteau word *S. Veslandrua’s* [Joyce 2000: 601.20] contains the plural of the Slavonic noun that stands in many Slavonic languages for “paddle”, which is associated with *Variagated Peddlars* [Joyce 2000: 310] and points to Russian culture. The Varangians (Varyags) opened a new route down the Dnieper River to Byzantine that influenced Christianization of Kievan Rus. It is known from historical annals that the Finns used to call them “paddlers”. The famous Russian saying “from the Varangians .to the Greeks” retains the memory of this group of Viking rulers in Kievan Rus. In *S. Veslandrua’s* Joyce might have conceptualized the way of getting in touch with a civilized world in the Medieval Ages. Unlike Kievan Rus, Ireland of that time suffered from ruinous raids of the Vikings and did not accept them as rulers.

The portmanteau word *Ciwareke* [Joyce 2000: 602.21] (Russian, Czech, Bulgarian “reka”) is doubled by the word “river” in the same sentence: *Bosse of Upper and Lower Byggotstrade, Ciwareke, may he live for river* [Joyce 2000: 602.21]. Joyce spells the Russian ending “a” in the first declension of Russian nouns as “e” (for example, “glave” instead of “glava” in Book IV). In Slavonic culture, spring water (melt water) conceptualizes AWAKENING, like in Ivan Turgenev’s novel *Torrents of Spring/Spring water* or Rachmaninov’s romance *Spring Waters*. Joyce used many names of Russian rivers throughout

his book. The first root in *Ciwareke* may refer to “civilized”, so the whole word conceptualizes uses of river routes for peaceful trade that facilitates peoples to gain from mutual influences. The dominance on the river route guaranteed prosperity and development.

The lexeme *bog* [Joyce 2000: 604.3] that stands in Russian, Bulgarian, Serbian, Croatian, and Polish for “God”, the Creator, is prepared by *the novened iconostase* [Joyce 2000: 603.35], which Sandulescu’s dictionary fails to reveal. The Greek word εικονοστάσι(-ov) (*eikonostási(-on)*) means “icon stand”; the ending “e”, which is not read in English words, makes this word sound like Russian “iconostas”. In Slavonic culture, there is a special corner with icons that is a sacred place in the house. Joyce places Kevin in this renewed corner, since Participle II contains the Russian root that stands for “new”. It is common in Russian to write “god” with a small letter, the capital letter is used when God is addressed with piety.

Joyce uses the key Russian cultural concept of SOUL verbalized in a repeated lexeme *douche* [Joyce 2000: 605.2] that refers to Bulgarian, Serbian, Croatian, and Ukrainian lexemes, as well. The spelling looks French, since a “sh” diagraph would correspond to Russian pronunciation of this word. SOUL, together with HEART, is a key cultural concept for Russians, namely, the locus of feelings. It is worth noting that the Druids who were in rivalry with St. Patrick believed in immortality of the soul. In Book IV, Joyce uses both the Russian and the English lexeme to conceptualize SOUL, whereas HEART is verbalized only by the English lexeme.

The Russian lexeme “pravilo” in *praviloge* [Joyce 2000: 605.7] (ORDER) deals with something that should be in compliance with law; the same idea is expressed by *His is house of laws* [Joyce 2000: 623.11]. This portmanteau word contains “logos” which has the same “e” ending as above mentioned “reke” and “glave”. Joyce might have pointed to language rules that govern text construction.

The use of *smolking* [Joyce 2000: 607.8] is linked with the Christian spiritual layer. The Russian verb “smolkat” conceptualizes SILENCE, a kind of deep spiritual stillness that leads to a divine revelation. This concept relates to a Byzantine mystic movement whose aim was purification of heart and going into the depths of oneself. Hence, this lexeme connects SOUL and HEART in SILENCE.

Among other lexemes of the Slavonic origin registered by Sandulescu are the Russian lexeme *stena* [Joyce 2000: 608.16] (“wall”), *neyets* [Joyce 2000: 608.21] (“no”); *domoyno* [Joyce 2000: 609.24] (the Russian imperative one-word sentence meaning “Home!”), *skulkasloot* [Joyce 2000: 610.14] (the Czech lexeme “skulkou” is an echo related to the shooting of the Russian general in Book 2.3); *deva* [Joyce 2000: 614.25] (this word is used for Virgin Mary), and some others.

Mention should be made of *newera’s day* [Joyce 2000: 623.7] that in English has a meaning of “new era” but can be read as Russian “ne vera” (that is, “possessing no faith”). FAITH (Old Slavonic вѣра) is a key concept in orthodox Christianity, so in Slavonic culture “without faith” is associated with atheism. In Christian culture, FALL dominates over human life that is sinful after eating forbidden fruit. Salvation and redemption are promised but they come as afterlife. Joyce relates AWAKENING to something like SALVATION reconsidered by SOUL and HEART through SILENCE. In line with this, Joyce uses *Arkangels* [Joyce 2000: 628.10], the last Russian word in the text that reminds of the city of Archangelsk in northern Russia (this city’s victory over the Swedish fleet opened a new era of Russia’s becoming a sea power) and the messenger of Christian faith.

In comparison with other “small” languages registered by Sandulescu’s dictionary, the number of Slavonic lexemes is not only impressive but also associated with key conceptualizations in world culture, like SOUL, FAITH, and HOME. To compare, in Book IV Joyce uses only one Lithuanian lexeme meaning “God”, three Japanese words meaning “fog”, “black and white”, and “color”, one Hungarian word, and one Finnish word. As

Joyce's choice of words is always precise, the presence of the Slavonic layer in Book IV is not haphazard. It continues to be used across the *Wake*. Joyce learned Russian, so he uses this Slavonic language most of all. Besides, the city of Sevastopol that Joyce mentions in the episode of the Russian general might have been the former motherland of the Celts [Hayman 1990: 40]. It is hard to say whether Joyce was aware of this hypothesis but he masterfully draws parallels between two geographical peripheries of world civilization, Ireland and Kievan Rus.

However, conceptualizations of the Slavonic layer may be traced in the following inclusions, as well. They are shown below as inferred cultural concepts (shown with capital letters).

1. FALL-LIGHT: ... *bludyn world* <...> *Calling all daynes* [Joyce 2000: 593.3, 593.11]. It may be inferred that a sinful world darkened by blood and conflict may be saved by a new day that brings awakening LIGHT. The word "day" that *daynes* incorporates reminds of Slavonic lexemes meaning the same word. In this context, FALL is associated with DARKNESS, whereas LIGHT brings AWAKENING.

2. FALL-HOME: *Dom on dam, dim in dym* [Joyce 2000: 625.20-21]. From this, it may be inferred: Houses are built on dams that protect their inhabitants from floods; the presence of people in the house is revealed by smoke coming from chimneys. Russian "dom" means "house, home". Ukrainian "dim" stands for "house", while coinciding in its form with the English adjective "dim". Old Slavonic дымъ καπνός is spelt as Slovak "dym", which designates "smoke". The concept of HOME (HOUSE) is universal for world culture: *How they housed to house you after the Platonic gardens* [Joyce 2000: 622.36]. Joyce conceptualizes human wanderings after the FALL and human life in the context of this SIN.

3. FALL-MASS MEDIA: *moskiosk* [Joyce 2000: 597.13]: It may be inferred as "Moscow" and "kiosk", a news agency TASS that was the official source of information in the Soviet Union; the lexeme "kiosk" is borrowed in Russian from German "Kiosk".

4. FALL-FORBIDDEN FRUIT: *You have eaden fruit* [Joyce 2000: 597.35-36]: Russian "eda" originates from the Indo-European root whose consonant is devoiced in English due to the First Germanic Consonant shift; Joyce's antanaclasis is formed by "eat" through the Russian lexeme and "Eden"..

5. FALL-AWAKENING: *The novened ikonostase* [Joyce 2000: 603.35]: Greek "iconostasis" is accompanied by the Russian lexeme meaning "new" and the English lexeme "oven", which is related to the houses with smoky chimneys mentioned above.

6. FALL-CONSCIENCE: *Sawyest* [Joyce 2000: 608:21): It sounds like the Russian concept CONSCIENCE; in Old Slavonic, "сѣвѣсть" is a Greek calque "συνείδησις" "conscientia". The spiritual concept CONSCIENCE, Gr. συνείδησις, εως, in Catechism implies the inner God's law, which is in line with Joyce's *praviloge* that includes "law, order" and "logos, word". As Joyce spells the Russian lexeme for "word" as "slove", he may use the same ending for "loge". *Sawyest* is associated with *the yest and the ist* [Joyce 2000: 597.11], so he may oppose the East and the West when he points to the Asians that used to awaken the Phoenicians during their raids. In the Russian cultural code CONSCIENCE is external in relation to SOUL and BODY (Joyce uses "glave" that stands for "head") Orthodox mentality connects CONSCIENCE with God. In Book IV all these associations are realized by the Russian lexemes.

7. FALL-AWAKENING: *Clatchka!* [Joyce 2000: 623.22]: It may incorporate three words: first, Russian and Ukrainian "clacha" that means "an old mare"; second, Russian "cachka" that stands for "rocking, pitching in the storm at sea"; third, the English lexeme "latch" that is related to "key".

8. CREATION: *Over Glinaduna* [Joyce 2000: 623.28): Russian, Bulgarian, and Polish "glina" stands for "clay". This creation material is combined with the Russian-looking lexeme

“duna” that designates “sand-hill” and is borrowed from Low German “Düne”. In the adjusting sentence, Joyce uses the English lexeme “soul” to conceptualize SOUL: *Ourselves, oursouls alone* [Joyce 2000: 623.28-29]. Hence, he links CREATION with the process of soul-making whose Slavonic verbalization is above mentioned.

9. CONSENT, AGREEMENT: *Taks to you* [Joyce 2000: 619.33]: Joyce uses the Ukrainian lexeme “tak” that stands for English “yes”.

10. TRINITY: *triune trishagion* [Joyce 2000: 605.14]: The Russian numeral “tri” of the Indo-European origin is repeated at the beginning of adjacent words.

11. HUMANITY: *Ludegude* [Joyce 2000: 626.6]: Old Slavonic людие stands for “people” and the English lexeme “good” is related to *Xaroshie* [Joyce 2000: 91.36] which in Russian has the same meaning “being good, doing good”.

12. SLEEP: *being in a dromo* [Joyce 2000: 598]: The Russian lexeme “dremat” means “doze, nap, slumber”. This state is a prerequisite for AWAKENING of SOUL and HEART.

13. NATURE, FOREST: *Lessnatbe angardsmanlake!* [Joyce 2000: 599.19]: Old Slavonic лѣсъ stands for “forest” and “lesnoi”. It creates a network with “garden” and “lake”.

From the above, the conceptualizations of SOUL are reinforced by the English lexeme that is inseparable from the pronoun “our” and acquires an individual-authorial meaning of TOGETHERNESS, meaning human efforts to overcome outcomes of the FALL, living life of hopeful AWAKENING, which is linked with physical deaths:

*When the moon of mourning is set and gone. Over Glinaduna. Lonu nula. Ourselves, oursouls alone. At the site of salvocean* [Joyce 2000: 623.28-29].

The concept of SOUL is a cultural constant for both Druids and Christians. The pagan meaning is achieved by the lexeme “glina” that involves such concepts as CREATION and FALL. The Christian concept SALVATION is linked by the portmanteau word with the ocean that was alien to Druidic cultural perceptions. From these adjacent sentences it may be inferred: DEATH is inherent in CREATION because LIFE ends with the death of SOLE MORTAL SOULS that spend life after the FALL in the hope of SALVATION and in the end are absorbed by AWAKENING, imprisoned by fatality of DEATH as the result of the FALL.

The following associations offer convincing proof: *with ambrosian Eucharistic joy of heart* [Joyce 2000: 605.33] (REVELATIONS OF HEART), *you’d give me the keys of me heart* [Joyce 2000: 626.30-31] (KEYS TO REVELATIONS may be traced in *clatchka*), *Kevin having been graunted the praviloge* [Joyce 2000: 605.7] (Kevin’s face is seen in the iconostasis), *leaving all the messymessy to look after our douche douche, the miracles, death and life are these* [Joyce 2000: 605. 1-2] (SOUL, DEATH, LIFE, ETERNITY – Joyce speaks about the miracles in which the Druid and St. Patrick competed and St. Patrick’s light bringing victory that has associations with the Russian city of St. Petersburg mentioned in Book 2.3).

Joyce’s epiphanic model identifies itself in Book IV: *Untisintus <...> obs of epiwo* [Joyce 2000: 611.24]. Joyce reduces *hueful panepiphanal world* [Joyce 2000: 611.13] to *epiwo*, giving his variant of FREEDOM from FALL that may be based on something other than SIN or SYNTHESIS, namely, observations of the epiphanic world. This world breeds doubling of floating meaning. The process of AWAKENING glorifies TOGETHERNESS as a means of human dialogical communication, whatever language is spoken.

The textual-stylistic concept TOGETHERNESS builds conceptual integrity of the epiphanic model by breaking antinomies between ACTION and NON-ACTION, UNITY and NON-UNITY (SOLITUDE). The markers of this model’s conceptual network are individual-authorial conceptualizations of TOGETHERNESS. The epiphanic model creates the *epiwo* that blurs the borders of the Self and the Alien, similar to the competition between St’ Patrick and the Druid. They both bring LIGHT, although it is external to one and internal to the other [McHugh 1976: 110-111]: ... *we have fused now orther* [Joyce 2000: 593.10-11]. Joyce’s

invention *orther* puts together ORDER (Russian *pravilologe* mentioned above) and the Other (Alien). Joyce arrives at the conclusion: *Only is order othered* [Joyce 2000: 613.13-14]. This last sentence states that *epiwo* fuses ORDER by integrating into the SELF (the English-speaking Irish writer) conceptualizations of the OTHER (cultural concepts belonging to many world cultures in their language conceptualizations). The matrix ACTION/NON-ACTION/UNITY/NON-UNITY identifies each opposition clearly.

In Book IV, ACTION-AWAKENING OF HUMANITY conceptualizes:

- ACTION-STREAMLIKE LIFE: *The untireties of livesliving being the one substance of a streambecoming* [Joyce 2000: 597.7-8]: Wholeness of LIFE along the path of AWAKENING (*Ciwareke* conceptualizes this inference);
- LIFE-CHANGE: *We annew* [Joyce 2000: 594.15]: Similar to the renewed iconostasis where Kevin's face appears);
- ACTION-MOTION: *... the is coming to come* [Joyce 2000: 598.10] (becoming a stream for AWAKENING);
- LIFE-AWAKENING: *sleeper awakening* [Joyce 2000: 597.26] (ACTION-AWAKENING from NON-ACTION of SLEEP: *From sleep we are passing* [Joyce 2000: 608.33-34]);
- MORTAL LIFE: *You have eaden fruit* [Joyce 2000: 597.35-36]; Russian "food" and Eden;
- LIFE-MOTION: *A gentle motion all around* [Joyce 2000: 622.12] (circularity);
- LIFE-CHOICE: *Since ancient was our living is in possible to be* [Joyce 2000: 613.9-10] (a possible association with *pravilologe*).

NON-ACTION conceptualizes:

- SILENCE (*you're silenced* [Joyce 2000: 594.36] – it corresponds to Russian *smolking*),
- DEATH (*Buried hearts, Rest here* [Joyce 2000: 595.28-29]),
- SLEEP (*a sound night's sleep* [Joyce 2000: 597.2] – it corresponds to Russian *dromo*).

Togetherness of ACTION/NON-ACTION conceptualizes LIFE'S WAITING. This opposition is traced in *Domoyno*, which simultaneously means "Home!" and "Not going home" (the Russian lexeme stands for "home" + English "no").

Hence, Joyce conceptualizes ACTION OF UNITY (= Life of mortal humanity after the FALL is sinful for all humans without exception) and ACTION OF SOLITUDE (= Each human being lives a life that ends in a physical death). Joyce binds LIFE-WAITING FOR DEATH with the universal cultural code SOUL, which is common to both Christians and Druids whose representatives compete in Book IV.

UNITY conceptualizes:

- HUMAN FALL (*pacnincstricken humanity* [Joyce 2000: 599.28], *togethering* [Joyce 2000: 601.31], *together fallen man* [Joyce 2000: 611.15-16], *the comprehension of unity* [Joyce 2000: 604.32]);
- DOUBLING (*pidgin fella Balkelly* [Joyce 2000: 27-28] – by this Joyce implies that a blend of forms bears a single conceptual meaning);
- SOMETHING LIKE THAT (*Only a leaf, just a leaf and then leaves* [Joyce 2000: 619.22-23], *Not a soul but ourselves* [Joyce 2000: 622.21] – the tree of life, a family of mortal humans, every human soul is opposed to mortal people).

NON-UNITY OF SOLITUDE (*Loonely me loneness* [Joyce 2000: 627.34]) for the first time in Joyce's idiostyle has conceptualized DIVERSITY: *So that when we shall have acquired unification we shall pass on to diversity and when we shall have passed on to*

*diversity*... [Joyce 2000: 610.23-25]. From this, it may be inferred that humanity, sharing the outcomes of the FALL, are in conflict with each other.

TOGETHERNESS conceptualizes two main directions: first, from ACTION OF NON-UNITY (human diversity in solitude of one) to ACTION OF UNITY (two, three, and more) and, second, from NON-ACTION (“sleep”, “dromo”) to ACTION of AWAKENING UNITY (includes *ciwareke*). For example:

*Passing. One. We are passing. Two. From sleep we are passing. Three. Into the wikeawades world from sleep we are passing. Four. Come hours, be ours!* [Joyce 2000: 608.33-34].

In all, human life is ACTION OF UNITY THROUGH WAITING with a view of NON-ACTION OF LIFE (= Humans are united by FALL and DEATH). This double consciousness results in ACTION OF NON-UNITY (= Home! To be saved!), limited by NON-UNITY for the sake of AWAKENING ACTION OF UNITY:

*My leaves have drifted from me. All but one clings still. I'll have it on me. To remind me* [Joyce 2000: 628.6-7].

TOGETHERNESS OF REVELATION BY WORDS-LIGHT OF SOUL AND HEART (FAITH) integrates into conceptualizations. Life begins with the locus of feelings (SOUL, doubled by the Slavonic lexeme, and HEART); it develops as NON-UNITY OF SOLITUDE that is reinforced by UNITY OF FALL: *First we feel. Then we fall* [Joyce 2000: 627.11]. The Slavonic layer through SOUL (*douche*), STREAM (*ciwareke*), LIGHT (*sweatoslaves*), GOD'S WORD (*slove, Bog*), HOME (*Dom on dam, dim in dym*), WAITING (smolking) are inherent in the construct of conceptual entirety. SOUL moves from LIFE OF WAITING to LIFE OF AWAKENING.

Bourbon claims that the *Wake* is not a fictional but a theological work of art [Bourbon 2004: 145]. The Slavonic spiritual layer is represented by SOUL, FAITH, and SILENCE. Dibernard states that the *Wake*, similar to alchemy, seeks harmony that crisscrosses eternal and universal for the purpose of sublimation [Dibernard 1980: 78]. No language is leading, for they all participate in conceptualizing TOGETHERNESS. In this regard I could say that the epiphanic revelation is essential to Joyce's idiostyle. Language, consciousness, and culture of the unified world whose diversity Slavonic conceptualizations celebrate together with other inclusions of human languages are at the heart of Joyce's individual-authorial understanding of TOGETHERNESS. SOUL and HEART conceptualize cosmic SOMETHING LIKE THAT that addresses purity of heart (*puritas cordis*) and spiritual exercise (*askesis*) to transform the human world burdened with inherited FALL.

In conclusion, the Slavonic cultural concept of SOUL is integrated into conceptual wholeness of Joyce's *epiwo*. SOUL is inseparable from his individual-authorial conception of purity of HEART, since Joyce's epiphanic model is grounded on revelations. The Slavonic layer, together with the inclusions of many languages, creates TOGETHERNESS of language, culture, and consciousness through diversity. Joyce values the concept of Slavonic SOUL for its deep understanding of the movements of the heart that unite conscience and soul-making awakening forces in continuity of change and renewal.

Thus, Joyce builds language conceptualizations whose diverse linguistic forms are flexible and have a potential of simultaneity of doubling. Meaning is blurred and the keys are given by conceptualizations that create associative networks whose cognitive forces need investigating further.

## Literature

ATTRIDGE D. *Joyce Effects on Language, Theory, and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

- BOURBON B. Finding a replacement for the soul: Mind and meaning in literature and philosophy. New Haven: The President and Fellows at Harvard College, 2004.
- DIBERNARD B. Alchemy in Finnegans Wake. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1980.
- EPSTEIN E.L. James Joyce and language. In: R.F. Peterson, A.M. Cohn, & E.L. Epstein (eds.). Work in Progress: Joyce Centenary Essays. Carbondale. IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1983. P. 58-69.
- HAYMAN D. The Wake in transit. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- JOYCE J. Finnegans Wake. L.: Penguin, 2000.
- MCHUGH R. The sigla of Finnegans Wake. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1976.
- SANDULESCU C.G. (ed.). A lexicon of "small" languages in Finnegans Wake. Bucarest: Contemporary Literature Press, 2012.

#### **Аннотация**

Славянский слой в заключительной книге «Финнеганова помина» Джойса участвует в концептуализации ДУШИ и СЕРДЦА, осваивая ПРОБУЖДЕНИЕ ОТ ГРЕХОПАДЕНИЯ в СОПРИКОСНОВЕНИИ сознаний, языков и культур через многообразие языковых форм в непрерывности ДЕЙСТВИЯ ЕДИНЕНИЯ. Славянская ДУША участвует в индивидуально-авторской концептуализации ПРОБУЖДЕНИЯ.