

UDC 81'42; 801.7

\*Zueva N.Yu., Tayeva R.M.

<sup>1</sup>Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

E-mail: nataliazueva@rambler.ru

### Stylistically Coloured Lexis and Artistic Speech

**Abstract.** A special place in the structure of the Russian language is taken by colloquial elements in the literary bookish language. The principles of constructing colloquial speech approximate it to the language of belles-lettres. Of interest is the problem of reflecting the colloquial speech of different social layers in a work of fiction: it refers not only to characters' direct, dialogical speech, but also to special features of colloquial speech which are used as signals of represented speech, the narrator's speech and speech of the author close to personages. The writer Yury Trifonov skillfully uses common colloquial and newly created lexemes for his heroes' typification.

**Key words:** colloquial speech, the language of belles-lettres, represented speech, Yu. Trifonov, the inlay of the literary speech.

#### Introduction

The language of belles-lettres represents the literary language, but at the same time it is original and specific. Artistic texts are the most important object of philological research, and with their help we understand the originality and complexity of the language of each individual work of fiction and overall artistic speech. According to A.N. Kozhin, they shed light on various aspects of verbal imagery structure of such a complex object as the language of belles-lettres [1, 3].

A work of fiction is an integral compositional and stylistic structure, which is based on the interaction of various language means. The author organizes the verbal material so that to express the main artistic idea in the best way while transmitting a particular content.

#### Methods

Theoretical analysis of literary sources, namely of the novels by Yuri Trifonov, from the point of using lexemes of other styles in a literary artistic text.

Theoretical analysis and generalization of scientific literature on the topic of research.

#### Main body

While investigating the style of the writer Yuri Trifonov, we are particularly interested in his work

on the language of the literary compositions and through it we define the ways of developing his creative manner. Historical thinking was peculiar to Yu. Trifonov; he analyzed each particular social phenomenon referring to reality as a witness and historian of our time and as a human inseparable from and vitally rooted himself in the Russian history: he in his creativity not only honestly and truthfully reflected various facts of our time, of our reality, but also sought to uncover the reasons for these facts. Social historicism is a fundamental quality of his prose [2, 24].

Yuri Trifonov himself said the following about his early works, or rather, about the language of these works: having written a lot of stories, even a novel in twenty-two printed pages, I did not understand completely – I only had a vague guess – that the main difficulty was to find words [3, 43].

What does the word mean? The meaning of the word is its relationship with the element of consciousness, with the concept, and what is more – with the feeling or the will. The study of stylistic and semantic features of words can not be conducted in isolation from one another, because it is difficult to determine the ability of a lexical unit to provoke stylistic impression without analyzing it.

V.V. Vinogradov wrote: «The word, the idiom in common colloquial language are closely fused with the object and have a sharp imprint of the social environment, of the image of the speaking subject, its expression. Together with words and expressions of the common colloquial language, syntactic constructions of the «live oral speech» invade the literary language» [4, 235]. The speech of characters in Yu.Trifonov's novels is built on this «power» of words. He is an «urban» writer, i.e. his characters live and act in the urban environment and they are the speakers of this environment and it is natural that in the language of educated, intelligent people, especially in their everyday speech, one can find «non-codified» elements.

What kind of words from this layer of vocabulary does Yu.Trifonov use for typifying his heroes?

An important place is occupied by nouns.

It is illustrated by the following examples:

– Razreshaeshj, ... on usmehaetsja. A mneslabo! Ja zheslabak! (You allow ..., – he grins. – It's feeble for me! I am a feeble creature! (*Beskonechnyjeigry / Endless games*))

– Smotrite, kakajakrasotka u nashegodrug! (Look at the babe of our friend!) (*Dolgojeproschanije / The Long Good-Bye*).

– Oi, Vitja ... Nu, pogovori s nashimZherekhovym. Ja ego seichasvyzovu. Toljko on boljshoiboltunivralj, imei v vidu (Oh, Victor ... Well, talk to our Zherekhov. I'll call him right now. Only he is a great chatterer and a liar, mind this. (*Obmen / The Exchange*))

– Tridsatjrublei, kotorye ja tebmogudatjnadorogu, – govorilaona, – sdelayuttebjaprikhlebatelem. (Thirty rubles I can give you for the journey – she said – will make you hanger-on. (*Drugajazhiznj / Another Life*))

The above mentioned examples of nouns *slabak* («feeble»), *krasotka* («babe»), *boltun* («chatterer»), *vralj* («liar»), *prikhlebatelj* («hanger-on») contain negative evaluation, but this evaluation does not strongly humiliate or offend the object of speech.

The following examples bear greater emotional and pejorative (almost abusive) evaluation:

– Nikto ne raskis. No mne eta gadostj ne nraivtsja (No one has become limp. But I don't like this dirt. (*Drugajazhiznj / Another Life*))

– ...A ja vsju zhiznj kuda-to karabkalsja, karabkalsja. Starostj ottogo, chto ustajeshj karabkatsja. Kakaja-to mura, ponimaete? (And all my life I have been climbing somewhere, climbing. The old age is because you get tired to climb. It's a mess (nonsense). Do you understand?) (*Predvaritelnyeitogi / Preliminary Conclusions*))

– No ionitozhedryanjlyudishki... Toljkovy ne gnevaitesj, ladno?... (But these little people are rotters... Don't be angry, okay?... ) (*Dolgojeproschanije / The Long Good-Bye*).

– Ne khochuchitatj, vsjomneizvestno... K chjortu... – bormotal on – Tozheumnitsa! Nadozabytj, otsechj, ne pomnitjvseietoidryani, a ona, kakna-rochno... Na cherta ono mnenuzhno, etopisjmo! (I do not want to read, I know everything ... What the hell... – he muttered. – Too clever! It is necessary to forget, to cut off, not to remember all this rubbish, and she, as luck would have it ... What the hell I do need it now, this letter! (*Drugajazhiznj / Another Life*))

For «imitating» colloquial speech the writer uses common-colloquial as well as newly formed (in accordance with productive patterns of colloquial speech) lexemes. Colloquial speech is characterized by spontaneity, lack of preliminary preparation and thinking.

The author chooses certain colloquial means for his characters and they help him in the expression and embodiment of the purport of the literary work. Thus, the selected linguistic means bear the «imprint» the author's language.

The language phenomena in a work of fiction always appear different in comparison with their usage in everyday life. It is explained not only by the fact that they are colored by various figurative, metaphorical and stylistic nuances and fused into a single imagery system by the idea expressed by the writer [5, 8].

In his novels Yuri Trifonov uses words taken from colloquial speech, and this is the reason why we would like to focus on the relationship between colloquial speech and fiction.

The principles of constructing colloquial speech make it close to the language of belles-lettres. The authors of the book «Russkayarazgovornayarech» («The Russian Colloquial Speech») consider that the «speaking subject» when using colloquial speech and the author of a work of fiction can creatively relate to the form of speech. However, if the work of art is always aimed at the form, then it is not obligatory but always conceivable for a speaker in colloquial speech [6, 7].

It follows that freedom in constructing linguistic units and freedom in selecting ready-made language items from the nationwide stock of the language are inherent both for colloquial speech and for language of belles-lettres. Modern colloquial speech and artistic speech are inclined to the tendency to «inlay» the literary speech with dialectal and jargon characteristics, individual deviations from the literariness

but against the background of common literary and precisely standardized speech [7, 5].

The freedom of building units and constructions typical of colloquial and artistic speech has not only similarities but differences as well: units and constructions similar in their form may have different functional loading in the colloquial language and in the language of belles-lettres.

A native speaker of the Russian literary language normally does not have a good command of dialects or colloquial language. He can use elements of one of them or another as intended inclusions.

«As for the Russian linguistic situation, then it is somewhat different. Carriers of the literary language use colloquial speech in the field of unconstrained personal communication. They can use elements of dialect or popular language only as inclusions – as a means of expressivity [8, 24].

Language game is widely used in colloquial speech. Elements of different layers and spheres of the national language (common colloquial layer, professional jargon and youth slang, dialects, different functional styles of codified literary language) as well as other languages can be used for language game purposes.

Language game in colloquial speech can be seen as the realization of the poetic function of the language. Language game is unpretentious fun and more or less successful witty remark, pun and different kinds of tropes.

Charles Bally says: It is obvious that speech in the broadest sense of the word, namely the national language, possesses aesthetic resources. A writer, who deliberately seeks to produce a particular aesthetic effect, does not create something new every time and draws the main elements of his style from the national language [9, 212].

The range of language game phenomena is wide. In colloquial speech language game can serve as a rich material for a writer.

There are the so-called two «types» of language game – buffoonery and wittiness. Both of them are peculiar to fiction.

The most common genre of colloquial speech is dialogue. According to L.V. Szczerba, the true existence of language is found only in dialogue. New words, forms and phrases are forged in dialogue. Everything that is said about the effect of different psychological and physiological factors changing the language is applicable to dialogue, and a man wishing to study these factors should apply to this form of manifestation of language [10, 104].

As an essential component of prose work composition, dialogue reflects the characteristics of the individual style of the author.

Individual skills are manifested in colloquial speech automatically and in fiction – intentionally. Speech act proceeds spontaneously, therefore, a certain freedom of manifestation of the individual in relation to language and its simultaneous connectivity with stereotypes are combined.

In the language of fiction the situation is different. Free, individualized selection of means of linguistic expression, stereotype and pattern are detached and contrasted in conditions of conscious, prepared language selection. If the author of a work of fiction unconsciously demonstrates the use of some features of his personal language experience, contrary to the aesthetic function of word choice, there appears violation of the laws of creation of a literary text [11, 29].

It is peculiar for the language of fiction to use linguistic resources of all the other language styles. Any linguistic unit, especially a polysemantic one, can be used a stylistic means.

From the stylistic point of view, the vocabulary of Russian language has been studied better than any other linguistic resources. But the problem of stratification of vocabulary still draws attention. Functional and expressive means are distinguished in the Russian literary language.

There are different opinions regarding the issue whether language elements marked in the dictionary as colloquial belong to stylistic means of the language.

The debates about the inclusion of colloquialisms into the literary language ceased after the publication of the paper by F.P.Filin «On the structure of the modern Russian literary language» [12,11].

In this article and in his subsequent studies, F.P.Filin showed a fundamental difference between the elements such as *karga*(«crone»), *kayuk* («it's the end of something»), *vypendrivatjsya*(«to put on airs»), on the one hand, and *prOcent*(«per cent»), *vyborA*(«election») used with a wrong word-stress, on the other hand. The first examples represent «language means, words, phrases, syntactical constructions, grammatical forms, peculiarities of pronunciation that are used by all educated people for coarse, derogatory images of the object of thought (a kind of «low style» of our time); the second group of examples represent «the elements of speech of people who have not quite mastered the literary language or are even semi-literate».

The extra-literary colloquial language includes language phenomena at all levels which are not used by an educated person under any circumstances, except when deliberately imitating or mimicking illiterate people. The elements of the first type are

called «literary colloquial language» by F.P.Filin, the elements of the second type are named «extra-literary colloquial language».

Those, who refer common colloquial elements to the facts of the literary language, define them as stylistically low means. But if some of the supporters of the indicated point of view distinguish common colloquial elements, others (e.g., Yu.S. Sorokin) do not consider the difference in the degree of intensity of coloring a sufficient ground for differentiating between these and other elements. Recognizing the common colloquial language as an extra-literary fact, linguists generally believe that it is by virtue of its extra-literary character can not belong to stylistic means of the literary language.

We adhere to the point of view of F.P. Filin, who believes that there are two (not one) common colloquial languages: 1) common colloquialism as a stylistic means of the literary language, 2) common colloquialism as the speech of people who have not sufficiently mastered the literary language.

The main reason for differences in understanding the composition of stylistically marked means and their differentiation is the fact that the notion of stylistic markedness is still uncertain, besides other problems associated with these means do not have an unambiguous solution.

Characteristic features of stylistically marked means found in our linguostylistics are quite diverse, nevertheless they can be divided into two groups:

1) elements used in all conditions of communication;

2) elements with stylistic coloring or expressiveness, according to terminology of some authors

It is widely believed that currently units with a distinct stylistic character are not numerous, at least less than in the previous period, while the number of stylistically neutral units has increased, and the pro-

cess of neutralization of stylistically marked means will continue. The leading trend of the development and interaction of styles is that they gradually lose elements with functional coloring (with the exception of terms) [13, 18].

At present, there are few linguistic units, which would be confined to certain types, forms and genres of speech. These obviously include the so-called non-codified elements.

### Conclusion

From the definition of stylistically colored vocabulary, it follows that it is necessary to distinguish between two separate tasks of its study.

One of them is the task of identifying potential stylistic features of lexical units for the purpose of their stylistic classification and subsequent stylistic differentiation of vocabulary.

The second task is the study of conditions for the realization of potential stylistic features and conditions for application of stylistically colored language facts in speech.

Ye.F. Petrishcheva in her book «Stylistically colored vocabulary of the Russian language» [14, 127] gives four separate types of stylistically colored lexis:

- 1) vocabulary describing the sphere of its use;
- 2) vocabulary that characterizes the attitude of the speaker to the object of speech;
- 3) vocabulary characterizing the speaker;
- 4) vocabulary enclosing «self-evaluation».

Since lexis bearing stylistic information is (conventionally) named «stylistically colored vocabulary», Ye.F. Petrishcheva, indicating the conventionality of terms, calls its types in the following way: functional colored vocabulary; vocabulary of expressive coloring; socio-colored vocabulary; aesthetically colored vocabulary.

### References

- 1 Kozhin A.N. *Stilistika hudozhestvennoi literatury*. – M.: Nauka, 1982. – P. 3.
- 2 Ivanova N.N. *Proza Yuriya Trifonova*. – M.: Sov. pisatel, 1984. – P. 24.
- 3 Trifonova Yu.V. *Vospominaniya omuhannemoty // Fedinsky seminar sorokovykh godov*. – Druzhba narodov. – 1979. – № 10.
- 4 Vinogradov V.V. *Ocherki po istorii russkogo literaturnogo yazyka XVII – XIX vekov*. – M: Vysshaya shkola, 1982. – P. 235.
- 5 Shansky N.T. *Lingvisticheskaya nali zhudozhestvennogo teksta*. – M.: Prosveshchenie, 1984. – P. 8.
- 6 *Russkaya razgovornaya rech. Obshchie voprosy slovoobrazovaniya. Sintaksis*. – M.: Hauka, 1981. – P. 7.
- 7 Panov M.V. *O razvitiu russkogo yazyka v sovetskom obshchestve // Voprosy yazykoznanija*. – 1962. – № 3. – P. 5.
- 8 *Russkaya razgovornaya rech. Obshchie voprosy slovoobrazovaniya. Sintaksis*. – M.: Hauka, 1981. – P. 212.
- 9 Balli Sh. *Frantsuzskaya stilistika*. – M., 1961. – P. 212.
- 10 Szczerba L.V. *Vostochno-luzhitskoe narechie*. – Petrograd, 1915. – P. 104.
- 11 *Stilistika russkogo yazyka: zhanrovo-kommunikativnaya spektstilistiki teksta*. – M.: Nauka, 1987. – P. 29.
- 12 Filin F.P. *O strukture sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo yazyka // Voprosy yazykoznanija*. – 1973. – № 2. – P. 11.
- 13 Akulenko V.V. *K opredeleniyu funktsionalnogo stilja // Vestnik Kharkovskogo universiteta*. – 1965. – № 2, vyp. 2. – P. 18.
- 14 Petrishcheva Ye.F. *Stilisticheski okrashennaya leksika russkogo yazyka*. – M.: Nauka, 1984. – P. 127.