

NORMATIVE ORIENTATION OF THE LANGUAGE OF FICTION: LINGUISTIC-AESTHETIC ASPECT

Gorina I. I., Gorobets L. N., Kozlova G. A., Nikulnikova Ya. S., Tanasova T.G.
Armavir State Pedagogical University, Russia.
Email: rektoragpu@mail.ru

Article History: Received on 25th July 2019, Revised on 31st August 2019, Published on 03rd October 2019

Abstract

Purpose: The article conducts the study implementation of the normative orientation of the language of fiction: linguistic-aesthetic aspect

Methodology: This is analytical-logical research done by content analysis.

Result: In the article, it is argued that normative orientation of the fiction speech is rather different from that of functional styles in which, as a rule, not only non-literary language elements but also specific phenomena of other styles are not used.

Applications: This research can be used for the universities, teachers and education students.

Novelty/Originality: A number of outstanding scientists such as V.D. Levin, N.A. Meshchersky, N.M. Shansky, N.L. Maksimov, D.N. Shmelev, K.A. Panfilov and others consider the language of fiction as a special type of the literary language which is characterized by aesthetic function and in which the particular peculiarities of all other functional styles can be found as well as non-literary linguistic means of different kinds: colloquial, slang, dialectal, etc.

Keywords: *the language of fiction, functional style, norms of literary language, non-literary linguistic means, aesthetic function, linguistic-aesthetic aspect.*

INTRODUCTION

The specificity of the language of fiction is determined by the fact that linguistic means that are used by the author are represented in a literary work to reproduce the real world of things, people, connections and relations in accordance with one's own aesthetic view on life and worldview. "Normative orientation of fiction speech is formed through other, higher criteria and norms which are conditioned by a special place and role of fiction speech compared to the literary language and its styles. The language of fiction is a language of the art of the word which the main function is an aesthetic one (in other words – image artistic function), though communicative function is manifested is fully manifested here" ([Shansky, 1992](#)). As L.Yu. Maksimov notes, the highest norm of the language of fiction is "an aesthetic motivation of this or that linguistic means ensuring individuality of this or that linguistic means that in turn provides individual expression" ([Maksimov, 1985](#)).

V.V. Vinogradov repeatedly expressed a different opinion on the language of fiction. According to V.V. Vinogradov, the language of fiction should be nevertheless considered as a specific functional style, in spite of its significant differences from other style types; it occupies a special place in the system of functional styles of the literary language. The language of fiction performs a communicative-aesthetic function and the range of its artistic expressive means is much wider than in other styles. This point of view is supported in the works of R.A. Budagov, A.I. Efimov, M.N. Kozhin, B.N. Golovin, A.N. Vasiliev, and other linguists. This position is the basis for our research. As the scientists note, the wide stylistic range of the language of fiction is determined by the fact that "speech means of literary fiction texts are oriented towards achieving visibility and concretization, which is why words and expressions must recreate imagery of the depicted. Due to this, speech means of different forms of the Russian language (literary language, territorial dialects speech, social-group speech, colloquial speech, etc.) are involved into the structure of such literary fiction texts as well as the means possessing expressive potential in different acts of individual author's use" ([Kozhin, 1985](#); [Sergiyovych, & Yevgeniivna, 2019](#)).

MAIN PART

The differences in the statements of the scientists regarding the place of the language of fiction in the system of styles of the literary language are often of a terminological nature. It is known that the main initial concepts of linguistic stylistics are, first of all, the functional style of a language and the style of speech. According to some scientists, the functional style is a phenomenon of a bilateral character. As V.D. Bondaletov notes, "It is originated from social practice, special tasks and communication goals in this or that sphere of human activity. But its essence is linguistic. It is a specialized subsystem of the literary language that uses such linguistic means and in such combinations that best corresponds to the given content and the purpose of speech" ([Bondaletov, 1989](#); [Baroughi & ZAREI, 2013](#)). In this regard, functional styles are often called functional types of language. A.N. Kozhin uses these terms as synonyms. The point of view of V.V. Vinogradov, A.N. Kozhin and other scientists who believe that language styles (or functional styles, and sometimes they are also called functional and speech styles) are the main kind of functional-stylistic stratification of the literary language; and as it was already noted, we consider this point of view the most appropriate. However, there is also a broader understanding of the functional types of literary language. According to D.N. Shmelev, "When distinguishing the main functional types of the literary language, it seems expedient to distinguish first of all: oral-colloquial speech, artistic speech, a set of functional-

speech styles fixed in written form" ([Shmelev, 2007](#); [Metsämuuronen, 2018](#)). In contrast to D.N. Shmelev's opinion, V.D. Levin, N.A. Meshchersky, N.M. Shansky, L.Yu. Maksimov and others distinguish two types of the literary language considering the language of fiction as a special type.

The division of historically established subsystems of the literary language into functional styles or types is largely connected with the unequal understanding of the role of extra linguistic and intralinguistic factors in their formation. Due to their dual nature, the classification of functional styles is based on two aspects: extra linguistic and linguistic proper. Some linguists consider the extralinguistic principle to be the initial and defining taking into account a large complex of extralinguistic factors: the sphere of communication, typical features of the content of communication, the purpose and role of communication, the form of social consciousness, the type of thinking characteristic of this sphere and type of social activity. On the other hand, without denying the importance of extralinguistic grounds some scientists try to be guided by proper linguistic indicators such as assets of stylistically colored means and devices, their correlation with neutral ones, special functions of language units and style as a whole, typical stylistic features ([Zalevskaya, 2001](#); [Tabatabaei et al., 2014](#)).

The typology of six functional styles of the Russian language suggested by V.V. Vinogradov became wide-spread in linguistic stylistics as well. V.D. Levin, N.A. Meshchersky, L.Yu. Maksimov, D.N. Shmelev and other supporters of dividing the literary language into two or three functional types take into account primarily intralinguistic features such as the systematic organization of linguistic means within this or that subsystem of the literary language in particular. Distinguishing three types of literary language D.N. Shmelev emphasizes that each of these varieties of the common-literary language is characterized primarily by a particular specific organization of common linguistic means. Such an organization is conditioned, first of all, by its functional orientation, and only then by some specific set of linguistic means; the separateness, the degree of "specificity" of this set is not the same for different varieties at all. However, the supporters of a single functional-style system of the literary language do not deny the special intrasystem organization of linguistic means in different subsystems of the literary language ([Selomo & Govender, 2016](#)).

The convergence of views on the intrasystem organisation of linguistic means in the subsystems of the literary language proves the fact that the different approaches to the determination of their status as functional styles on the one hand and as functional types of a language, on the other hand, does not lead to deep, fundamental and principal disagreements in understanding of their internal organization and correlation with the common system of the literary language. None of the supporters of the highest status position of the language of fiction considers it to be a special, second literary language. Calling the language of fiction, a type of the literary language V.D. Levin, N.A. Meshchersky, N.M. Shansky, L.Yu. Maksimov and D.N. Shmelev consider it as a functional subsystem of a single literary language. Thus, it means that despite the existence of special literary, aesthetic, functional norms in the language of fiction, it is primarily subjected to unified general literary norms like all other functional subsystems ([Shansky, 2008](#)).

The history of the modern Russian language serves as an important argument to support the unity of its system. The Russian literary language with its present-day system of norms was to a large extent formed on the basis of the language of fiction. Literary works of N.M. Karamzin, I.A. Krylov, A.S. Pushkin, N.V. Gogol, L.N. Tolstoy, I.S. Turgenev, and other prominent writers played an exceptional and crucial role in forming and developing of the system of common national literary norms.

Up to the middle of the XVIII century when the consistent system of unified national literary norms did not exist yet, the uses of colloquial and dialectal forms of speech as a means to express comic effect in the Russian literary fiction and political journalism were unknown. Even in the middle of the XVIII century, according to a classical tradition represented in the M.V. Lomonosov's theory on three styles, colloquial means were not to be used in high genres, whereas in comedy, low genres they were widely used and understood as a norm. In his work "Essays on the stylistics of the Russian literary language of the late XVIII-early XIX century" V.D. Levin notes that "the unified system of common national literary norms started its formation as a whole in the period of N.M. Karamzin, after that it was expanded and completely established in the period of A.S. Pushkin" (Levin, 1984). "The new style" of N.M. Karamzin and his school had a consistent system of literary norms. Only from that time in the last decades of the XVIII century deviations from the literary norms as a means of cosmism started to be used in the Russian literature including colloquial linguistic forms of speech, deviations from the norms of the Russian language in the speech of foreigners or in the speech of Russians under the influence of foreign speech. The works of D.I. Fonvizin can serve as an apt illustration. However, in the preceding period even in traditional, low, comic genres the problem of deviation from literary norms was not aesthetically actualized and, thus, non-literary speech norms were not implemented as a means of cosmism.

The lexicographic theory and practice, as well as the theory and practice of teaching the Russian language in secondary and higher school, can serve as significant evidence to the unity of the system of norms of the modern Russian literary language. The Russian lexicography starting from "Dictionary of the Russian Academy" is based on the explicit recognition of the unified Russian literary language and on the unity of literary norms of its all subsystems. In academic dictionaries illustration materials supporting dictionary norms are taken not only from scientific but also from publicist works and fiction literature. At the same time, it should be noted that the share of illustration reference materials from the works of A.S. Pushkin, L.N. Tolstoy, I.S. Turgenev, A.A. Chekhov, and other prominent writers is much bigger than the

total amount of examples taken from non-fiction texts. This fact supports the idea that in fiction texts not only common dictionary literary norms are observed but also, they are considered and represented as examples of literary norm and models of unified literary language. To point out deviations from literary norms special dictionary labels are used: colloquial, dialectal, jargon, slang, archaic. Definitions with such limited labels indicating their non-standard character are supplemented with quotes from fiction literature which classifies the use of colloquial, dialectal, jargon words as a violation of the literary norm, as irregularities from the standpoint of the unified literary language.

Illustration and reference material mainly from fiction literature is represented in scientific grammar of the Russian language as well. There is still not a single scientific work that would consider and describe any specific norms of the fiction literature that would be different from the unified common literary norms. N.A. Meshchersky, N.M. Shansky and L.Yu. Shmelev considers in their works only particular aesthetic norms which "admit functionally motivated use of non-literary means in fiction literature, additional functional norms that determine aesthetic motivation of this or that linguistic means ensuring individuality of artistic expression" ([Meshchersky, 1981](#)). But all functional subsystems of the literary language have their own additional stylistic norms, for instance, in publicist where non-literary means are also often implemented in special expressive means and artistic functions.

The principle of the unity of the literary language and its norms has long been the basis for teaching the Russian language at school. Any deviations from the literary norms in modern school practice are called speech errors. The reasons for the deviations can be different. They may include the lack of knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, the influence of dialects, colloquial speech, jargon and interlinguistic interference in the conditions of a multilingual environment. The facts of negative interference in the sphere of pronunciation, inflection, and word usage occupy a special place in the system of speech deviations from literary norms, however, they are literary irregularities and in the practice of studying the Russian language they are unequivocally regarded as speech errors ([Jaramillo, 2018](#)).

The phenomena of negative interference that are phonetic, morphological, lexical deviations from the norms of the Russian speech, for example, under the influence of the Ukrainian language are considered unambiguously as faults and speech errors that violate literary norms of the Russian language. V.M. Rusanovsky, G.P. Izhakevich, N.S. Ozerova, M.A. Britsin, V.I. Kononenko, M.N. Nesterov, G.M. Chumakov and others in their works provide numerous examples of different "Ukrainians" that are qualified as deviations from the norms of the Russian literary language ([Nesterov, 2001](#)).

Scientists note that the comparative study of expressive stylistic shades characteristic of genetically cognate vocabulary in the Ukrainian and Russian languages and, consequently, objective opportunities of the interfering effect of one language on another in the use of these lexical units have an important meaning for preventing speech errors connected with interference at the stylistic level. The speaker is often unaware of expressive stylistic differences between the Ukrainian-Russian genetic lexical correlatives. This can lead to unconscious transition of expressive stylistic relations characteristic of the Ukrainian lexical system to the Russian lexical system in which vocabulary, genetically cognate with the Ukrainian language, is in another expressive stylistic relation and has other expressive stylistic shades from the standpoint of codified literary norms.

SUMMARY

In the language of fiction aesthetic norms are observed as well. These aesthetic norms involve functionally motivated usage of both literary and non-literary norms in the fiction literature. The first includes linguistic means of bookish speech and literature-colloquial speech, while the non-literary means include colloquial, dialectal, jargon, archaic and other deviations connected with interlinguistic interference. Non-literary means, as well as the means of other functional styles, do not perform communicative functions in fiction literature. They rather perform diverse aesthetic functions: artistic function, the functions of socio-verbal characteristics of a character, of local and ethnic characteristics, of historical stylization and of satirical-humorous cosmism.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the conducted research is an important constituent part of the scientific conceptualization of the norms of the fiction language including linguistic-aesthetic aspect.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST / ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors confirm that the data do not contain any conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Maksimov, L.Yu. (1985). The literary language and the language of fiction literature. *The fiction text analysis*. Moscow.
2. Jaramillo, L. E. S. (2018). Malware Detection and Mitigation Techniques: Lessons Learned from Mirai DDOS Attack. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering & Management*, 3(3), 19. <https://doi.org/10.20897/jisem/2655>
3. Kozhin, A.N. (1985). The functional types of the Russian speech. M.: Vysshaya shkola.
4. Bondaletov, V.D. (1989). The stylistics of the Russian language. L.: Prosveshchenie.

5. Shmelev, D.N. (2007). The Russian language in its functional types. M.: Nauka.
6. Metsämuuronen, J. (2018). Common Framework for Mathematics – Discussions of Possibilities to Develop a Set of General Standards for Assessing Proficiency in Mathematics. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 13(2), 13-39. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iejme/2693>
7. Zalevskaya, A.A. (2001). Text and its understanding. Tver: TSU.
8. Badakhova I.T. (2017). Formation of professionally significant qualities of future managers in the training process forming. *Modern Scientist*. Issue 7. P. 81 – 84.
9. Shansky, N.M. (2008). The linguistic analysis of the fiction text. Moscow.
10. Selomo, M. R., & Govender, K. K. (2016). Procurement and Supply Chain Management in Government Institutions: A Case Study of Select Departments in the Limpopo Province, South Africa.
11. Borisova M.V., Musokhranov A.Yu., Sidorova N.A. (2018). Use of fitness directions elements on physical education classes and their psychomatic impact on students of the special medical group. *Modern Scientist*. Issue 1. P. 6 – 9.
12. Levin, V.D. (1984). Essays on the stylistics of the Russian literary language of the late XVIII-early XIX century. M.: Nauka.
13. Meshchersky, N. A. (1981). The history of the Russian literary language. L.: Publishing House of LSU.
14. Sergeeva M.G., Trubakova D.I. (2017). Teacher's Reflection Formation as Factor of Effectiveness Children's Social Intelligence Forming. *Modern Scientist*. Issue 7. P. 62 – 64.
15. Nesterov, M. N. (2001). The comparative stylistics of the Eastern European languages. Kiev.
16. Kryuchkova K.S. (2018) Modular training of future teachers with the use of information technologies in the conditions of virtual academic mobility. *Modern Humanities Success*. Issue 4. P. 9 – 14.
17. Sergiyovych, K. O., & Yevgeniivna, B. O. (2019). Components of future social workers' readiness to implement mediation. *Opción*, 34(86-2), 280-293.
18. Baroughi, E., & ZAREI, M. H. (2013). The Ranking of Effective Factors on Efficiency of Commercial Ads In Attracting Viewers In Tehran, Iran, *UCT Journal of Management and Accounting Studies*, 1(1): 22-28.
19. Tabatabaei, F., Karahroudi, M. M., & Bagheri, M. (2014). Monitoring and zoning sultry phenomena in the southern provinces of Iran, *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 2(3): 1-8.